MR. CHAIRMAN: He is the last speaker. Now, the Minister will reply after his speech.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala): Sir, yesterday, I have been called to speak...(*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, you are there. ...(*Interruptions*).

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI (Kerala): Sir, what about other parties? We are waiting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That I will see later on. First, Mr. Vayalar Ravi is there.

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI: Sir, Members from so many parties are there. ...(*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, sit down. Let him speak. Tell me after that. Please, take your seat. ...(*Interruptions*). Please, take your seat.

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI: Will we get a chance to speak? Sir, it is a very important subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know it is an important issue.

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI: Why are we denied, Sir?

श्री सभापति: तो आप बैठिए। ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI: Why are we denied, Sir?

श्री सभापति: अभी कहां है? अभी तो ये बोलेंगे, उसके बाद आपका नंबर है।

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Internal Security situation in the country—*Contd.*

DR. GYAN PRAKASH PILANIA (Rajasthan): Sir, I have the privilege, as has been permitted by your honour, to put forward the scenario pertaining to the internal security of this great nation. During the last 2-3 days, there have been very illuminating speeches on this issue in this august House. And, I trust that two unanimous points have emerged out of that. One is that a national concern is there regarding internal security. The internal security matter is not a partisan issue, it is not an issue pertaining to any

one group or party, it is not a matter to exchange allegations and counter-allegations, but, it is a matter of utmost national importance about which national consensus should emerge through debates from the Houses of Parliament. It is not a partisan issue, but it is a national issue, which concerns everyone. This was one unanimity assumption arises. Another was that the internal security scenario is a matter of concern, not only concern, but of grave concern and anxiety. It is disturbing; it is challenging; it is alarming. Maybe, it is not a matter of planning, but it is a matter which needs very serious consideration. I think, hardly any illustrations are needed to state that during the last so many years, internal security scenario has not been a normal one. Assassination of a Prime Minister on 31st October, 1984, assassination of a former Prime Minister on 21st May 1991, assassination of a Chief Minister of a State are some examples of this. There are enough instances to state that there is something wrong, perpetuating constantly on the internal security scenario.

Sir, then the horrendous attack on that black day of 13th December 2001, on this august Parliament which is the citadel of democracy in this country. I shudder to think, what would have happened had only one terrorist entered the portals of the Parliament. It was great gallantry and sacrifice of eight persons. Two of Watch and Ward, five of the CRPF and one of Delhi Police, and even a gardener, contributed their blood to save the security and honour of Parliament. Was it not enough to shake us? Only three days back, we paid homage to those martyrs. Not only on Indian Parliament, but there was an attack on J&K Assembly also on 1st October 2001. I think, Sir, there are enough pointers to convince everyone that there is something to think about on internal security scenario.

As far as common man is concerned, I think, everyone is aware about it. And in spite of the seat of the Central Government being in Delhi, a Swiss citizen had to say that Delhi is not safe for women. दिल्ली महिलाओं के लिए सुरक्षित नहीं है। Minors are being raped. Delhi is not safe for minor children. Senior citizens are being murdered. Some time back, a Lieutenant-General and his family were murdered. Neither childhood nor womanhood nor aged citizenry is safe even in Delhi, what to say of that horrendous murder of a Member of Parliament, Smt. Foolan Devi! Instances can be quoted *ad nauseam*.

Some days back, there was the news about the rape of a medical

student of Maulana Azad Medical College on *Khooni Darwaza* and the trial is going on and the sentence is to come very soon for the three rapists. Lives of ordinary men and that of VVIPs are not safe, not even property is safe.

By quoting statistics, circulated by the Home Ministry, it cannot be said that things are improving, or things are better now. Regarding statistics, I would just like to mention that statistics are like bathing suits. What they reveal is suggestive, but what they hide is vital. In this report also, there are certain admissions that things are deteriorating. It is not because of this Government or earlier Government, but it is because of certain more deep-rooted causes, that law and order scenario is getting deteriorated to that extent where we can say that it is impinging on internal security.

I would like to submit here, in this context, with your permission, three basic postulates. One is that internal security is more than law and order, as was very beautifully and eloquently projected by Dr. P.C. Alexander yesterday. I think it needs a little more elaboration. Law and order is primarily a State subject for which States are responsible. Internal security can also be said, to some extent, a State subject, but not primarily. Primarily, internal security relates to the nation and international security is concern of the national Government, of the Central Government and of the hon. Home Minister, from which he cannot abdicate. That responsibility squarely lies on him. It is because of this that there are CPOs, it is because of this responsibility that there is Intelligence Bureau, it is because of this responsibility that there is a control in the hands of the Home Minister as far as the whole country is concerned. So, confusing and laying blame at the door of the State Governments would not solve the matter. Law and order is one of the parts which impinges on internal security, and as General Roy Chowdhury had yesterday said, the line between the law and order and internal security is a thin one, but the line is definitely there and that is one thing which has to be thought of. Another thing is, if internal security fails, the very foundation of the State is in danger. And there is every possibility that the State will disintegrate. So, internal security threat is not a threat to life and property of an ordinary citizen; it is a threat to the very fabric of the State and there are galore examples on the international stage about how States have withered when their internal security has been jeopardised. So, this is also to be taken care of that if internal security fails, the sovereignty of the nation is in jeopardy. External security deals

with border and that occasion arises rarely, it may be in 1962, it may be in 1971, if there is a war in Kargil, it may be there, but internal security is constantly there. It is a continuing process and hence handling internal security is more difficult — it is a 24-hour job — than handling external security. But deterioration in internal security ultimately jeopardises external security also.

Another postulate is there, Sir, and that pertains to the statement that terrorist is not born. A person who harms internal security most and whose weapon is violence and whose strategy is fear and whose aim is terror, that terrorist is not a born person. There must be certain causes, there must be certain reasons, there must be certain circumstances which give birth to a terrorist, and until and unless those circumstances are looked into, are appreciated, eliminated and removed, terrorism will be there — whether it may be in the form of PWG, whether it may be in the form of Maoist threat, whether it may be in the form of Naxalite threat, and just to repeat them or to enumerate them in brief, I would say, Sir, they are economic exploitation, they are regional imbalances, they are trivial aspirations, they are outcome of neglect, they are basically outcome of some kind of injustice, it may be social, it may be economic, it may be political. There will be some kind of discontent or some kind of oppressive law, such kind of law which makes law impossible. Till these basic factors which motivate a tribal to take to the gun, which motivate a poor man to fight and become a robber, which motivate a commoner to become a law-breaker, till these fundamental root causes which are embedded in some kind of injustice or in poverty or in unemployment are met with, there will some kind of resurgence in one area or the other which will destruct internal security. The law and order situation will definitely be grave. But it will be in one corner or the other of the country. As far as internal security scenario is concerned, Sir, I would like to go into eight facets of it, as briefly as possible, because, I am well aware of the time constraint, and the value of the time of this august House. They are: (i) infiltration and proxy war theatre of J&K; (ii) insurgency and secessionist movement in the North-East; (iii) naxalite terror and Left Wing extremism; (iv) Maoist threat in Bihar, Jharkhand and on Nepal border; (v) PAN Islamic fundamentalism, which is usually external;..(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your time is over.

DR. GYAN PRAKASH PILANIA: Sir, I will conclude very shortly. Mine is the maiden speech, and I am aware that Your Honour are always kind to the maiden speaker. I will just conclude within a minute. (*Interruptions*) As far as Rajasthan is concerned, internal security, I think, is on even kneel there. But as far as the 1040 kms. border with our neighbouring State is concerned, on which there are madarsas and infiltrators also operate there, that is a matter of concern. And last, but not the least, I will conclude by saying that the most dangerous of all these activities is the naxalite terror, which at present, has spread its tentacles into 157 districts in 13 States, that is, in about 27 per cent area of the whole country. This is most sinister, this is most dangerous, and this is one thing. which if not controlled, will lead to a disaster for the country.

I know, Sir, with such an august House, and with yourself in the Chair, the safety of the nation is in very secure hands. But I would only like to state that there is a need for alarm; there is a need for concern, there is a need for constant vigilance on this front. I am grateful to you for your kind indulgence. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the issue that has been raised is a very important issue. But I would like to know whether such an emergent situation has developed to discuss this matter at this point of time. Sir, you know that this Government has been in power only for the last six months. I would like to know what the compulsions are to hold such type of discussion. I could not find anything. Moreover, when I was going through the speech of Shri Arun Shourie, who has raised the discussion on this subject, down to Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilania, who spoke just now, I found that there is a lot of confusion in the mind of my hon'ble friends, who are sitting on the other side of the House. In fact, they have not been able to reconcile themselves with the new situation so far that they have to sit in the Opposition. That is the main thing which I found. So, what Mr. Shourie has said and what Mr. Pilania said is that the law and order situation in Delhi is very serious and kidnappings are taking place. There is no doubt about it. It has happened. Is it such a serious matter which warranted discussion on the internal security? Of course, it is a law and order problem; I do not deny that. But there should not be any confusion in our mind.

I now come to the point that was raised by Mr. Arun Shourie. He

has compared the situation by making a reference to the last 20 years; '20 year's means '1984-2004'. Sir, my party ruled the country for about nine years, and his party ruled the country for about six years. Other parties also had been in power. Members of various political parties are sitting in this House Every political party has been a part of the Governments which ruled the country for the last 20 years. What is the allegation made? In those 20 years, he says, 19,000 people have been killed. Yes, 19,000 people have been killed, but including 5,500 security persons. And he is sorry that only 19 persons have been convicted! yes, that is a fact,. But who is responsible for that? What were you doing? What had you been doing for the last six years? Had you tried to prosecute or arrest any person? Had you put anybody in jail? You can say that you have introduced POTA! But I can also give you an answer; the Congress Government since its inception has paid a political price as well as a physical price while enacting the legislations like the National Security Act, MISA down to TADA, ...(*Interruptions*)

श्री सभापति: माननीय सदस्यों से कहना चाहता हूं कि आज बिजनेस बहुत है, लंच ऑवर नहीं होगा, इसलिए कोई लंच करना चाहे तो बीच में जाकर लंच करके यहीं आ जाएं।

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, the point is, 19 people have been convicted. Yes, we have to get more convictions. How many persons have been arrested? As Mr. Pranab Mukherjee said the other day, terrorists are not standing on two wickets; who should be arrested? It is a kind of Guerrilla war. Now, the point is what has happened in the last six months. I am not blaming anybody sitting on that side. The attitude of the Government, the approach of the Government should be to see what is happening and what is going to happen. Sir, the hon. Member who spoke earlier, has mentioned about the attack on Parliament. He has also mentioned about the attack on the Legislative Assembly of Jammu & Kashmir. The same thing I am asking. It seems as if it has happened in the last six months. All these incidents have happened. The attack on Parliament was a most heinous crime done by certain terorists. It happened during the tenure of my hon. friends who were ruling the country! It was very shocking. Sir, has they got any imagination? It happened after the attack on the J&K Legislative Assembly. That showed the trend of the terrorists, to attack the Legislatures. Had they taken any precaution? Had they got any intelligence reports? They did nothing. They speak of internal security today! They should have

done some kind of thinking that it could spread to other parts of the country. They never thought about it. The Parliament was atacked and our Watch & Ward staff as well as our jawans had to sacrifice their lives to save the lives of the politicians or the political elite in this House. Sir, when did that happen? Is the same situation existing today?

Sir, we have to look into another problem, *i.e.*, the Naxalite problem, to which the hon. Member has referred. My friend from Telugu Desam has also spoken about that. There was an attack on the Chief Minister. The Chief Minister was attacked in Andhra Pradesh. I am happy that by God's grace he was saved. We all prayed for his safety. But how had it happened? He was also a supporter of the NDA Government. The question is: Can we blame this Government for not dealing with the Naxalite problem? After the attack on the Chief Minister, or even before that, and after the continuous raids or whatever that might be, the Government should have tried to combat the fight or face the threat. The Home Minister had been killed. In that State, earlier, the then Home Minister — I do not want to mention his name — was killed by the Naxalites. The same Government continued to rule over there for 13 years. What did they do? I am not blaming them. But that was the situation. I am not finding faults with anybody; I am not blaming anybody. It is a national problem for which all of us have to find a solution together. I do not want to blame anybody. But you have to see the reality. Before pointing a finger at us, you should try to see the reality. I feel that this is a matter which should be looked into from a national perspective. Now, there is no attack on any temple. But mosques have been attacked and temples have been attacked during the rule of their own Government. The Akshardham Temple was attacked when their own party was in power in Gujarat, when their own party M.P. was the Home Minister at the Centre. The BJP says that they have been adopted by God. Even God was not safe under their rule. This is what happened in Gujarat. This is not something which I am saying.

Now, let us look at the other questions. Mr. Arun Shourie's speech was confined mainly to the Task Forces. He had mentioned that the four Task Forces had informed, etc., etc. He had also mentioned about the Kargil war. I don't want to go into the details of Kargil war. The BJP Government at that time might have been very grateful to President Clinton who kept on saying to find out a solution. I stop at that because we had discussed that matter in this House earlier. But the point is this. A Task

Force had been constituted. Its Report had come. But who prevented you from implementing it? Definitely, this Government will look into it. The Government will study the Report and whatever measures need to be taken, we will take them. But they had to wait for the Kargil war to make a report.

Sir you may recollect that my party had supported every effort to normalise the relations with Pakistan. We supported it. We supported even the Lahore Declaration, though they tried to minimise the importance of the Shimla Agreement, the Shimla Pact. Yet, the Congress Party said, "Yes, you carry on. We want to have normal relations with Pakistan". But what happened thereafter? Thereafter, we had the Kargil war. so, all these things had happened during the regime of the previous Government. In spite of the steps that they had taken, all these things had happened in respect of internal security and external security. Now, the same persons, the same hon. Members, are raising a hue and cry that nothing has happened in the last six months. They ask, "What has happened in the last six months in Jammu and Kashmir and the North East?".

Sir, I know there is some time constraint. The North East issue is not a new issue. Dr. Alexander knows it better. The North East issue has been discussed. We have to find a solution through discussions. Of course, there were a lot of confrontations and a lot of people died. But, today, the North East is known as the Seven Sisters. How have these Seven Sisters been created? These Seven Sisters have been created by an attempt by the then Government, by the then Prime Minister, to bring the people of the North East to the mainstream of the Indian body politics. We wanted to bring them to mainstream and we had brought them in. Yet, there are certain people left out. There have been dialogues. The dialogue in Nagaland is going on. Mr. Deputy Chairman, you may recollect that, in Mizoram, Mr. Laldenga had been brought to the mainstream. He became the Chief Minister of Mizoram. He had been brought to the mainstream. It was because of the dialogue. Arms alone will not solve the problem. So, the Government thought to divide the North East into seven States, Seven Sisters, give them political authority and make them part of the governance of the nation. We tried to solve the problem that way. These are not new issues.

The same is the case with Kashmir also. Mr. Sheikh Abdullah

had been released and the power was handed over to them by the Congres Government. In Assam, the Congress Chief Minister resigned and gave power to those people who were agitating. It was to protect the internal security. That is the sacrifice which we have made. We did not stand on political prestige because we wanted to find a political solution. We have done it periodically by sacrificing our own Governments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, this is the last point. I am concluding. I don't take much of the time of the House. You know that I don't speak all the time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are foregoing lunch hour so that we can do some more work.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I know that.

THIS MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ): He has come on his own after a long time.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, as regards the Naxalite issue, we have to look into the political environment. The hon. Home Minister must look into this point. In the context of internal security, the political environment, especially, in respect of Naxalites, should be looked into by the Home Minister. Naxalism cannot be compared with the terrorists and cross-border terrorism. The cross-border terrorism in the North East cannot be compared with the Naxalite problem. The Naxalite problem arose in 1967. My State has successfully prevented—I don't say eliminated—or controlled Naxalism. Being the Home Minister of Kerala, I was the one who released the Naxalite prisoners from jail. Today, they are all very good persons. Some of them are in politics. Somebody has become a priest. Mr. Vellathuval Stephen, who is very famous, has become a priest now. Such is the attitude that we should adopt. I can't disagree with Dr. Alaxender on one point — he made an eloquent speech -- that the Naxalite problem cannot be solved by arms alone. It can be done only through a dialogue. We have to decide whether we should sit and discuss with them; we have to decide how to attend to the problem. I appreciate the initiatives taken by the Government of Andhra Pradesh; also, the Government of India convened a meeting of the Chief Ministers of all the affected States to see how to tackle this issue. Sir, the naxalite problem had to be tackled in a

social manner. I don't agree with the theory that if we give employment to everybody, this will be over. I don't agree with that point. That only gives more incentive to young people to take up arms. They think, "If we don't employment, we should take up arms." Yes; there is a problem. The tribal belt has been neglected for a long time. People there have problems, and these problems have to be looked into. These include economic as well as social aspects. Of course, the Panchayati Raj system, that we have today, has given them powers and brought them into the mainstream. Sir, in this context, I would say that the Forest Preservation Act. That we have, needs an amendment. This Act prevents them from taking their own products in the forest areas, and the tribals are facing harassment from officers-in-charge.

Sir, the problems created by the Maoist groups had its origin in Nepal. But, as everybody knows, it has come down from Nepal to Bihar, from Bihar to Orissa, from Orissa to Madhya Pradesh and from Madhya Pradesh to Maharashtra and Karnataka. They pose very great threat to us. I can tell you one of my experiences. I was travelling by an overnight train to some place, and when we reached Gulbarga in the early morning, the train stopped. Somebody told me that the Naxalites seemed to have placed a bomb in the train. When I wanted to get down and find out what was happening, they stopped me from getting out. And, the train was late by two hours. Sir, we experience the Naxalite problem in our State also. But, here, we must understand one or two important things. The Naxalites, or the people going with arms, are threatening the State itself. They feel that they are not bound by the Constitution, that they are not bound by the law of the land. They defy the Constitution; they defy the State. But there is protection for them under the Constitution because of human rights. Now, Sir, we all know that the former Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, was herself a victim of terrorism. Shri Rajiv Gandhi laid down his life. These are the great people we lost because of certain terrorist elements.

Now, when I talk about harassment meted out to the police officers, I should mention here an instance where two police officers had to commit suicide because the political environment changed. These police officers face threat to their lives while tackling the internal security of the country. But, thereafter, when political changes take place, you persecute the same police officers. These demoralises the police force. How are we going to tackle this problem?

Sir, I will conclude with only one sentence. The internal security problem is a national problem. But, in this period of six months, nothing has happened that warranted such a discussion. This only shows the mind-set of the people sitting on the other side. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, much has been said regarding vital issue relating to national integrity and security. I don't want to repeat them. But I have to mention about certain problems within a short time.

श्री राजीव शुक्ल (उत्तर प्रदेश): मान्यवर, इतने गंभीर विषय पर चर्चा हो रही है और सदन में न नेता विपक्ष हैं, न उपनेता हैं और न चीफ व्हिप हैं। सब गायब हैं। यह इनकी गंभीरता है।

श्री रूद्रनारायण पणि (उड़ीसा): सब आ रहे हैं।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल: सर इतना गंभीर मसला है और न नेता विपक्ष हैं और न उपनेता हैं। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रूद्रनारायण पणि: सर, जो सदस्य इस बात को उठा रहे हैं, एक समय वह भी अनुपस्थित रहते हैं। ... (व्यवधान)... हम उपस्थित रहते हैं, इसलिए बोलते हैं।

श्री उपसभापति: गवई जी, आप बोलिए। ... (व्यवधान)... देखिए इस में समय जाएगा। आप बैठिए।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (उत्तरांचल): उपनेता, विपक्ष तो सात बजे तक यहीं बैठी रहती हैं।

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (Maharashtra): Sir, as I have been saying, this issue relating to national integration and internal security is very vital. This is not something that relates to a particular political party or a particular Government. As a matter of fact, these issues must be discussed cutting across all party-lines and political differences. I do not intend to find fault with the previous Government; nor I say that they have done nothing. Of course, during this period of six months, the UPA Government has been dealing with these issues, and I do not claim that these issues have been solved, but I do want to mention humbly that the situation has been dealt with. Now, the question arises whether the internal security situation has worsened or improved. If it has worsened, then we can draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that as compared to the situation prevailing earlier, it has worsened. But today the situation is totally different. Of course, I am not going into any comparison between this Government and that Government. Now, in this regard, there are a few figures available from

the report subrnitted by the Home Ministry. I am not comparing but, looking at the figures, I can say that, at least, there is some solace. Now, talking about the security situation in J and K and, in particular, about the trends of infiltration in J and K, it is mentioned that during 2001, there were 175 infiltrations; during 2004, up to October, *i.e.*, today, there are 100. Again, during 2001, the estimated number of infiltrators was 3545; today it is 496. The number of infiltration bids foiled during 2004, up to October, 2004, is 38. Sir, these are the figures made available by the Home Ministry. Then, I come to the violence profile in the North-Eastern Region during 2001, 2002, 2003 and till 31st October, 2004. The number of incidents in 2001 was 1340; today it has come down to 905. As far as the State-wise security situation in the North-East is concerned, in Assam, 460 incidents occurred during 2001; today, the number is 226. In Manipur, the number of incidents that took place in 2001 was 265; today, it is 261. I don't want to read out all these figures because it will take a lot of time. What it shows is that the situation is improving. The situation has not worsened from what it was earlier. This Government has been in office for just six months. At least, we must appreciate that the Government is taking some positive steps to improve the overall internal security situation in the country.

Sir, now I want to deal with a vital problem, probably, I am referring to it for the first time. I am happy that the hon. Prime Minister and the Government has started a dialogue with the terrorists and their organisations. I think, this is the essence of democracy. The essence of democracy demands that you should mend these persons. The decision of the discussion is the essence of democracy. We are supposed to bring back those people into the national mainstream. So, if the Government starts a dialogue with them, it is a welcome step. We should not criticise it. The dialogue should not be at the cost of the unity and integrity and the sovereignty of the nation. To start a dialogue with them does not mean that they are dictating to us. We have started a dialogue, let us hear from them also. So, on this issue, there is some sort of unanimity. So, I welcome this step taken by the Prime Minister. Starting a dialogue with them may be a one-way action.

Sir, recently, I attended the World Buddhist Peace Conference at the invitation of the Kind of Nepal wherein many delegates participated. The delegates welcomed the steps taken by the Indian Prime Minister and said that peace is the fountain for peace, stability and everything. Here is

1.00 P.M.

the action of the hon. Prime Minister of India who has come forward to have a dialogue for establishing peace. Not only that, he has declared a relief, which is, certainly, a greater relief. In this way, he has started a new era. I have got the figures with me what he has declared. These figures can be referred to from the book of the Home Ministry. On seeing these figures, one can come to know that whatever package the hon. Prime Minister has declared for the State of Jammu and Kashmir, it will have healing effect.

Sir, before concluding my speech, I do want to refer to the speech made by Dr. P.C. Alexander. I welcome his speech, I request the hon. Home Minister to take his speech in the right perspective. He has just warned about the Naxalite problem. We are dealing with the Naxalite problem. As far as the Naxalite problem is concerned, in some States it has decreased, in some States it is as it is and in some States it is increasing. We must remember that this is a contagious disease. It has spread to 157 districts of our country. So, it is not the entire responsibility of the State Governments to deal with the Naxalite problem. The Home Ministry or the Home Minister should not shirk its or his responsibility in this regard. Like external security of the country internal security is also the moral and bounden duty of the Government. So, this is a warning. The suggestion given by Dr. P.C. Alexander cautions, warn the Government about the Naxalite problem which is spreading like a contagious disease throughout the country. With these words, I conclude.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Prof. Ram Deo Bhandary, not present. Shri Sharad Anantrao Joshi, not here. Shri M.P. Abdussamad Samadani.

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI (Kerala): Sir, I am thankful to you for permitting me to take part in this discussion. I am not going into the details of the subject. I am only utilising this opportunity just to mention a few points here with all importance and seriousness.

Sir, when we take part in this discussion, I am reminded of that great masterpiece work of Prof. Arnold Joseph Toynbee, one of the greatest historical philosophers of the modern world. His famous work is 'The Study of History.' It is said that he spent forty years of his very precious life in writing this book. The book consists of ten volumes. While going through

the contributions made by all civilisations in the human history, he reaches a conclusion -- most of the civilisations came to a downfall because they faced great problems of disintegration not from outside but from within themselves.

So, Sir, considering this thing, there is no need to underline the point that internal security is very important for any nation. Sir, I would like to mention here that the forces of disintegration are not only political, but also cultural and social. So, a country has to give importance to the cultural unity. With all seriousness, the importance has to be on that. Then only the forces of disintegration can be fought effectively.

Sir, there must be a very comprehensive plan on the part of the Government. I think, there is a great scope for a healing touch to the wounded souls. I am reminded of the speech made by the Home Minister when he was replying to the debate on the POTA Repeal Bill. The hon. Home Minister himself mentioned the relevance of a comprehensive approach towards this problem.

So, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the Government for a political solution of the problem. I am not contradicting, nor am I entering into an argument with my hon. friends who are sitting on the other side. But, Mr. Arun Shourie, the hon. Member, who took part in the discussion, was referring to madrasas so many times. Some other hon. Members use terms like, Islamic fundamentalism. Sir, this is a very wrong approach. Religion is religion. Communalism is communalism. Religion can't be linked to communalism and communalism can't be linked to religion. Both are to be kept separate. This kind of an approach will only contribute to bringing disintegration and that will only contribute to polarisation of the society. We have to fight polarisation and forces of ghethorization appearing in certain parts of the country. This kind of element can be fought only by the feeling of oneness. Communalists have no religion. When our hon. friends refer to Islamic fundamentalism, is Islam responsible for it?

It was reported by the media during the Gujarat genocide, when people who committed great crimes against men and women some of them were uttering shlokas from the Hindu texts, while they were committing great mistakes to humanity, how can we call them Hindus? I don't believe they are Hindus because Hinduism is a religion of universal brotherhood. Hinduism is a religion which trusts on:

माता च पार्वतीदेवी पिता देवो महेश्वरः। बांधवाः मानवाः सर्वे।।

The whole mankind is a single fraternity. Everybody is related to each other. This is the teaching of every religion.

Prophet Mohammed according to the man who gives a call to communalism is not my man. He doesn't belong to me. If a man creates a communal problem, or if he kills or gets killed, he doesn't belong to me. The Prophet used the term असबीयत in Arabic, which can be very clearly translated in English as 'communalism.' The same term was used by the holy Prophet fourteen centuries back.

So, Sir, it is a wrong statement when our hon. brothers, comrades who sit on the other side repeatedly refer to *madrasas, madrasas.* I saw this word four times in the text of Arun Shouries speech published by the Rajya Sabha Secretariat. Mr Arun Shourie was repeatedly referring to *madrasas.* May be, in the full text he might have referred to it several other times. But I remember an occasion when the NDA Government was ruling the country, we certain MPs gave a request to the them Home Minister to bring a White Paper on the role of the *Madarasas* and whether there was any anti-national acitivity going on. The Home Ministers reply was that no such *Madarasas* were identified up to that day. But, Sir, the propaganda is contrary to the facts. So, Sir, my request to the Government, to the hon. Home Minister is that he should try his level best to control the communal elements, the forces of disintegration, the forces of polarisation ghettoisation and criminalisation. Sir, at the same time, there is no doubt that terrorism has to be controlled. Terrorism has to be controlled strictly with all measures. It is the duty of the Government. Terrorists have no religion. Whether he belongs to this community or that community, we must stand united, the nation should stand united against the forces of disintegration but please don't associate this kind of anti-national elements with any religion or any community. Sir, again, there is a need for working hard for the cultural unity of the country. There is distortion of history, distortion of historical facts. Sir, what is history? History is a record of the past. History is a record of the rights and wrong done by a society. There will be achivements and mistakes and there will be positive things and negative things. History is a gramophone kept. It has voices of the society. There will be horrible voices; there will be musical voices. No doubt about that. But, Sir, we should rectify the mistakes and bring peace to the

contemporary society. In our own history there are great achievements, which our nation has made, our people have made in the annals of history. For example, who is now remembering Tulsidas. Tulsidas has written *Ram Charit Manas* and in the same book he says that he was lying in front of the mosque. Muslims gave him all the facilities and he was treated like a guest there. When he used to write this book he was the guest of a mosque, of a *masjid*. The same Tulsidas was great *Bhakta* of Rama. I am not referring to these kinds of facts. But there are this kind of golden chapter in our history has but there is an intentional attempt to bury those factors and to search for some of the unfortunate incidents from history of the country only to utilise it as a weapon to split the country's unity and to bring disintegration. Sir, I am just concluding. I think our hon. Deputy Chairman will be just reminding me about the constraint of time. Sir, we have, as a nation, a common heritage. My request to the hon. Home Minister is: the common heritage of the country and patriotism of a citizen should not be questioned by anybody, whether it is a mojority community or a minority community. Sir, there was census a few months back. There was a hue and cry created by the result of that survey. After all, the hon. Home Minister came to this House and he clarified the situation. Throughout the country certain sections made it a propaganda only create confusion, only to create misunderstanding. Sir, what is the use? We are Indians. Even if there was a growth of certain community, that was contradicted by scientific sources. I think the hon. Home Minister himself has given a clarification with regard to that. But, Sir, I am only saying that this kind of emotional feelings are used as tools to break unity in the society. My request to the Government is that: you please punish the criminals who are working against the unity of the country. But Sir, please protect the innocents. Godhra is a very unfortunate incident. They are to be punished. Whatever punishment has to be given to them, please give it to them. Find out who are the criminals. When we boast about the great progress of humanity, when we speak of the great ideological values of humanism, what is the justification for hurting the innocents? So the country's internal security will be a reality only when the innocent citizens of the country have a feeling of security. Sir, there is no need to remember:

आदमियत है ऐहतरामे आदमी,

वा खबर शुआज़ मकामे आदमी।

Humanism is respect to man. Only when we have a feeling of respect for man and respect the dignity of mankind, then only we will able to bring our country's unity. Pluralism is very important. Only by keeping and protecting pluralism, we will be able to help the law-keepers and punish the law-breakers.

Finally, I would like to mention one point. There are some prejudiced approaches. One of my friends from Kerala, who spoke before me, brought unnecessary things there. He has brought our Industry Minister into this discussion. I cannot understand the relevance of the Industry Minister of my State in this discussion. It was unnecessarily brought before the House. It was politically motivated. It is a fabricated story being used for political mileage. Even the comparision was wrong. He was comparing the Industries Minister of Kerala against whom there is no case with another person against whom there are so many cases.

Finally, Sir...

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN (Kerala): Sir, the matter is before the court...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI: If it is so, why was it brought before the House? ...(*Interruptions*)...It has nothing to do with the present debate...(*Interruptions*)...I have not brought it here.

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN: He has made a public speech by violating the Constitution of India.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Samadani, you please conclude...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI: Who has brought this matter before the House?...(*Interruptions*)...I am only mentioning it ...(*Interruptions*)...I did not being it before the House ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us not go into it...(*Interruptions*)...It has nothing to do with the debate...(*Interruptions*)...Please conclude.

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI: Sir, I am concluding the quoting a couplet form Alladma Iqbal...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD (Bihar): Mr. Samadani, you have made a very good speech. You have also said that the national security should

be above partisan considerations. But, I am afraid, in the concluding part of your speech, you have brought exactly that issue of Kerala before the House. It is better to have avoided...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI: My dear brother, I have not brought it. Somebody has brought it before the House...(*Interruptions*)...I did not bring it. I am only responding to that charge...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us not go into that ...(*Interruptions*)...Whatever you have said, you have said. Whatever he has said, he has said. the chapter is over now...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI: Sir, let me clarify the position...(*Interruptions*)...I did not bring it here. Somebody else has brought it. I was only responding to it...(*Interruptions*)...Somebody has brought it before the House unnecessarily...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is his right to rebut...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI: I have a right to respond...(*Interruptions*)...I seek you protection, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री रद्दनारायण पणि: उपसभाति महोदय, ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री उपसभापति: छोड़िए आप, इसमें आप क्यों दखल दे रहे है? इसमें आपका क्या इंटरेस्ट है? आप बैठिए। आप बैठिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री रद्दनारायण पणि: फंडमेंटलिज्म के बारे में बोले थे। ...(**व्यवधान**)... What about minority fundamentalism?...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री उपसभापति: नहीं-नहीं, कुछ नहीं बोले। आप जब बोलेंगे तब..(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI: Sir, I am being interrupted ...(*Interruptions*)...I seek you protection...(*Interruptions*)...my final point is this. The internal security is very much linked with the national integration. so, my request to the hon. Home Minister is to bring a comprehensive plan which is culturally and educationally sound to strengthen the forces of national integration.

I will be concluding by quoting a couplet from Alladma Iqbal:

ग़ैरियत के पर्दे एक बार फिर उठा दे।

बिछड़ों को फिर मिला दे, नक्शा-ए-दुई मिटा दे।

एक नया शिवाला इस देश में बसा दे।

That शिवाला must be the temple of love, fraternity and tolerance. Thank you.

SHRI NABAM REBIA (Arunachal Pradesh): Thank you, Sir, for having given me this opportunity to participate in this very important debate on the internal security of the country. I would like to confine myself mostly to the North-Eastern Region. I would like to request you to be kind to me because, I think, I am the one Member from the region to participate in this very important discussion. I am reminded of one public address made by our late beloved leader, Rajiv Gandhi. On his maiden vist to Arunachal Pradesh, before he became the Prime Minister of India, he said, "इस मुल्क के दुश्मन इस मुल्क के अंदर हैं" Whatever remarks Rajivji had made were justified. today, I think, the communal forces are the number one enemies of this country. Therefore, I would like to appeal to the Government to firmly deal with the communal forces. I am happy that in the Common Minimum Programme of the UPA Government, under the heading 'Defence and Internal Security' the concluding paragraph says. "The UPA Government will take strictest possible action, without feat or favour, against all those individuals and organizations, who spread social discord, disturb social amity, propagate religious bigotry, and communal hatred. The law of the land would be enforced effectively." I welcome this stand of the UPA Government. Therefore, I would like to request the Government not adopt any appeasement policy, be it whosover-the religious groups or the communal groups. They should be dealt with firmly. Almost every Speaker, whosoever has spoken here, has referred to the North-Eastern Region. The influx problem from across the border, from Bangladesh, is one of the major problems. As one of the speakers said, the demographic pattern of the region is being threatened. It is a very serious thing to be thought of. We also have the information that there is a design to carve out a 'Bengali-speaking Muslim country' from the region. I believe, the people of the North-Eastern Region are quite aware of this; and will not let any such country to emerge from the region. The role of the ISI has been very active. The intelligence Bureau and the RAW should have played an active role in

finding out where the ISI operations are taking place in the region. I also welcome the recent dialogue of the UPA Government with the NSCN leaders. For that matter, I would also like to suggest that talks with the ULFA and the other insurgent groups of the region should also be held. But whatever talks are held, in my opinion, in the interest of national honour, such talks should be held within the Union of India, within the country itself. Such talks should not be held outside the country. This is in keeping with the national honour of our country. Our concern is, let there be a political solution to these ongoing problems. The Government has assured us, time and again, that the map of the North-East Region will not be redrawn. We are happy with this stand of the UPA Government. Therefore, in our Common Minimum Programme also the Government has resolved that the UPA Government is determined to tackle terrorism, militancy and insurgency in the North-East as a matter of urgent national priority. All the North-Eastern States will be given special assistance to upgrade and expand infrastructure. The North-East Council will be strengthened and given adequate support. The territorial integrity of the existing States will be maintained. This is very, very important. The effort to bring a solution to the problems of a State should not become the cause of other problems in region. Therefore, I welcome this dialogue process of the present Government with the Naga leaders. I would request the Government to prevail upon them to see that, extortion process in the region is stopped henceforth. Our previous Government; the NDA Government was in a hurry. They were the champions of the cause of Chakma refugees in Arunachal Pradesh. And, finally these people have been given citizenship rights. This is for the information of the Home Minister, and I think, he knows it already that the Chakmas have started killing the people of Arunachal Pradesh today. It is, probably, in the knowledge of the hon. Home Minister that the Chakmas had abducted one member of Zilla Parishad in the Changland district of Arunachal pradesh on 26th November. And he was ultimately, murdered on 30th November. This is a serious thing. I request the Government to take note of this. We have no objection if the Chakmas are given Indian citizenship, but they have no right to kill the indigenous people of Arunachal Pradesh.

I would like to suggest to the Government as many speakers have mentioned that the police force in the country should be modernised and upgraded. I think this will be a first step towards maintaining internal security in the country. Most of the police force in our region, particularly, in the

North Eastern Region, is not equipped with the modern weapons. And, there is a need to upgrade police force all over the country.

Steps should be taken to remove poverty, unemployment and illteracy. In this connection, we are happy that our Government in its Common Minimum Programme— this was there in their agenda—has made a proposal to enact a legislation, that is, the National Employment Guarantee Act. I request the Government to bring forward this legislation at an early date so that employment avenues are provided to maximum unemployed people of the country.

I don't want to take much of the precious time of the House. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am extremely grate to you for having given me this opportunity. And, I, once again, repeat that we must firmly deal with the communal forces so that there is communal harmony amongst all the religious groups in the country. Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Bashistha Narain Singh. Three more Members have to speak. Kindly conclude it in 5-10 minutes.

श्री बशिष्ट नारायण सिंह (बिहार): उपसभापति महोदय, आज सदन में हम एक बहुत गंभीर और संवेदनशील मसले पर विचार कर रहे हैं। बहस में न्याय भी हुआ है। ऐसे संवेदनशील सवाल पर सदन में ज्यादा समय दिया गया है, ज्यादा देर तक चर्चा हुई है। महोदय, मैं सतह पर जो समस्याएं बड़े पैमाने पर दिखाई पड़ रही हैं, उन सभी पर विस्तार से अपनी बात नहीं रखूंगा, क्योंकि समय कम है। जैसे काश्मीर के सवाल पर ज्यादा अटेंशन खींचा गया है, पूर्वोत्तर राज्यों में हिंसात्मक प्रवृत्तियां बढ़ी हैं, उन पर सदन में ज्यादा ध्यान दिया गया है, सदन में ज्यादा चर्चा हुई है। नक्सलवादी समस्या के ऊपर सदन में चर्चा हुई–तो ये ऐसी समस्याएं हैं जो हाल में पैदा नहीं हुई हैं। ये समस्याएं इतिहास से जुड़ी हुई हैं और इन समस्याओं का सुलझाने के तौर–तरीके, जो पिछली सरकारें आई हैं, उन्होंने भी एडॉप्ट किए हैं। गृह मंत्री जी जब जवाब देने लगेंगे तो इन समस्याओं पर भी वे अपनी राय रखेंगे, अपनी बात रखेंगे कि सरकार ने क्या–क्या कदम उठाए हैं। चाहे सीमावर्ती राज्य हैं, सीमा की सुरक्षा का सवाल है, चाहे कश्मीर की समस्या सुलझाने के लिए सेना में कटौती करने या सेना वापस लेने का सवाल है, चाहे तो अलगाववादी और उग्रवादी तत्व हैं, उनके साथ पूर्वोत्तर राज्यों में बात करने का सवाल है, इसके संबंध में स्वयं गृह मंत्री जी इस सदन में जवाब देंगे, लेकिन हमको लगता है कि देश के हरेक राज्य में कुछ न कुछ खतरा पनप रहा है। कुछ राज्य चिन्हित किए गए हैं, जो नक्सलवादी समस्या की रेंज में यानी उसके प्रभाव क्षेत्र में आ गए हैं।

महोदय, हिंसात्मक गतिविधियों को देखने के तौर–तरीके, उनसे निपटने के तौर–तरीके अलग

हो सकते हैं। कश्मीर की समस्या से निपटने के तौर-तरीके और नक्सलवाद और उग्रवाद की समस्या से निपटने के तौर-तरीके, नज़रिए में फर्क होंगे। फर्क स्वाभाविक है – एक ओर सेना की भूमिका ज्यादा होगी और दूसरी ओर जो नक्सलवादी समस्या है, उसमें सामाजिक और आर्थिक पहलू को भी नज़र में रखना पड़ेगा। पूर्वोत्तर राज्यों में जो समस्याएं पैदा हुई, उसमें संघीय ढांचे को बनाए रखने के लिए, उनकी गतिविधियों, उनके ढांचे और उनके स्वरूप का भी पता लगाना पड़ेगा। लेकिन महोदय, जब से वीरप्पन की घटना इस देश में हुई, यह कोई आइसोलेशन में एक घटना नहीं है, मैं आज उससे अपनी बात इसलिए शुरू करना चाहता हूं कि देश में खतरा पैदा हो रहा है। आतंकवाद का, जो आंतरिक सुरक्षा से संबंधित है का खतरा पैदा हो गया है हिंसात्मक प्रवृत्ति का, यदि बड़े पैमाने पर प्रसार हो जाए तो देश के नौजवानों के एक वर्ग में ऐसी भावना पनप सकती है। गृह मंत्री जी, हमको खतरा दिखाई पड़ता है कि यदि ऐसे तत्वों के विरुद्ध तत्काल प्रभावकारी और ठोस कदम नहीं उठाए गए, तो कहीं देश के नौजवानों से एक वर्ग में यह जीवनशैली न बन जाए। ऐसी समस्याओं का यदि बड़े पैमाने पर पता नहीं लगाया गया तो कहीं आतंकवाद बहुत से लोगों के लिए आजीविका का साधन न बन जाए, इसका खतरा है। खतरा इसका भी है कि कई राज्यों में लोकतांत्रिक शक्तियों पर इनका प्रभुत्व और प्रभाव न बढ़ जाए। खतरा इसका भी पैदा हो गया है कि विकास के सवाल पर आज जो खर्च हो रहा है, कहीं विकास के रास्ते में ये तत्व बाधक न बन जाएं। यह खतरा मुल्क के सामने है। महोदय, मुल्क के सामने सबसे बड़ा गंभीर सवाल, चूंकि एक घटना का मैं वर्णन करना चाहता हूं, एक महानायक आज हमारे बीच में नहीं है–स्वर्गीय जयप्रकाश नारायण। मैं उनका उल्लेख इसलिए करना चाहता हूं के संदर्भ इस रूप में आ चुका है कि उस संदर्भ को आज सदन में रखना मुझे आवश्यक लग रहा है। चूंकि कांग्रेस पार्टी के अश्विनी कुमार जी ने बड़े ही अच्छे शब्दों में, तार्किक ढंग से, प्रभावशाली ढंग से जब सरकार के रुख के विषय में अपनी बात रखी तो मुझे बहुत प्रसन्नता हुई, खासकर प्रधान मंत्री जी के बयान का हवाला उन्होंने दिया। गृह मंत्री जी का बयान भी हम लोग पढ़ते रहते हैं। उन्होंने कहा–हमारी एप्रोच ह्यूमिनिस्टिक होगी। उन्होंने कहा कि इस तरह के तत्वों से निपटने के लिए हमारा ह्यूमन फेस है। मुझे लगा कि यह अच्छी बात है। आज देश में जितनी समस्याएं हैं, यदि उन समस्याओं से, इस ढंग से निपटा जाएगा तो इसका समाधान हो सकता है। इसलिए मैं स्वर्गीय जय प्रकाश नारायण की एक घटना का उल्लेख करना चाहता हूं । एक ऐसा व्यक्ति जो कभी सत्ता व्यवस्था में शामिल नहीं हुआ था और उसके सामने दस्यु सरगनाओं ने अपने सोफिस्टीकेटिड आर्म्स के साथ, समपर्ण करने का काम किया था। चूंकि ह्यूमन फेस की बात आपकी तरफ से उठी है, इसलिए मैं उसका उल्लेख करना चाहता हूं। जब उन लोगों ने जय प्रकाश नारायण के सामने समर्पण किया तो उसके कुछ वर्षों के बाद बिहार मूवमेंट में, एक प्रभावशाली दस्यु सरगना बिहार में आने का काम किया था। जिस समय बिहार मूवमेंट चल रहा था। उस समय उनसे बातचीत करने वालों में, मैं भी शामिल था। मैं भी जेप्पी मूवमेंट से आया था। मैंने उस व्यक्ति से एक सवाल पूछा था कि आप यह तो बताएं कि आप लोग

इतने प्रभावशाली क्यों हैं? क्या कारण है कि आप के साथ, लोगों की इतनी संख्या बढती जा रही है? वैसे तो उन्होंने बहुत सी बातें की थी, जैसे कि कैसे सरेंडर किया, कैसे मन में जय प्रकाश नारायण के सामने, आर्म्स समर्पण की बात उठी, मैं इनकी चर्चा नहीं करना चाहता हूं, लेकिन उन्होंने मुझे दो प्रमुख बातें बताई थीं। उन्होंने कहा कि हम लोग जिन गांवों में जाते हैं, तो वहां के प्रधान जिस ढंग से हमारा स्वागत करते है, वहां के नौजवान उसे देखते हैं कि इस तरह की गतिविधियों में लिप्त रहने वाला व्यक्ति भी सम्मान पा सकता है तो इससे उनके मन में एक ललक बढ़ती है। यदि बहुत से लोग बेरोजगार होंगे तो उनको भी यह रास्ता सहज दिखाई देता है और उस सहज रास्ते में, एक सहज रास्ता यह भी अपनाते हैं। इसलिए, मैं आज यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यदि नक्सलवाद की समस्या का सामाधान करने की कोशिश करेंगे तो आपको इन चीजों के ऊपर भी ध्यान देना पडेगा. ...(समय की घंटी)... कि आर्थिक समस्याएं हैं, हम उनको इस नजर से देखेंगे कि जिन लोगों ने परिस्थिति से प्रभावित होकर आर्म्स उठाने का काम किया है, उनके लिए विकास ही ऐसा रास्ता है, जो उनको आर्म्स से मुक्ति दिला सकता है और उनको राष्ट्र की मुख्य धारा में ला सकता है। मैं मंत्री जी से आग्रह करना चाहता हूं कि आप हमारी सीमा पर चौकसी बढ़ाएं, साथ ही आप बातचीत का दायरा भी आगे बढ़ाएं। आप से कोई नहीं कहेगा कि आप बातचीत के रास्ते को अख्तियार मत कीजिए। आप सरकार चला रहे हैं.....(समय की घंटी).... इसलिए आपको इस बात का ख्याल करना पड़ेगा कि "Iron hand with a golden heart" आपको एक पॉलिसी बनाकर, ऐसे तत्वों के साथ निपटना होगा, लेकिन सरकारी खौफ कभी खत्म नहीं होना चाहिए। इस बात पर भी आपको ध्यान रखना चाहिए। महोदय, समय की घंटी बज गई है, इसलिए मैं कुछ सुझाव दे देना चाहता हूं। मेरे सुझाव प्वाइंटेड हैं। इसके बाद मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करूंगा। मैंने वीरप्पन की घटना का उल्लेख किया था। क्या मंत्री जी इस सुझाव पर विचार करेंगे, कि दो राज्यों की पुलिस ने मिलकर वीरप्पन को खोजने का काम करके, उस समस्या का निदान करने का काम किया था, तो क्या आप संघीय अपराध शाखा का निर्माण करने के सवाल पर कुछ विचार करेंगे? हमारे समाज के दबे-कुचले वर्ग, चाहे वे पहाड़ी इलाके के हों या आदिवासी इलाके के हों, जहां आज तक विकास की किरणें ठीक से नहीं पहुंच पाई हैं, क्या हिसांत्मक गतिविधियों को रोकने के लिए, बातचीत और पुलिस खौफ के अलावा आप उनके विकास के लिए कुछ उचित और कारगर कदम उठाएंगे? जो अपराधी और उग्रवादी संगठन हैं, आज उनके स्वरूप और स्रोत के विषय में पूरी जानकारी प्राप्त करनी बहुत जरूरी है, तभी उन्हें डील करने में आपको आसानी हो सकती है। मैं मानता हूं कि सुचना और संचार व्यवस्था, सरकार जितना भी ढिंढोरा पीट ले, लेकिन ऐसे तत्वों से निपटने के लिए आज सूचना और संचार प्रणाली को अत्याधुनिक बनाने की जरूरत पड़ गई है। क्या आप इस सुझाव पर गौर करेंगे? एक और जवाब आपसे चाहूंगा....(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापतिः आप कन्क्लुड कीजिए।

श्री वशिष्ठ नारायण सिंह: आतंकवाद से निपटने के लिए आपने राज्यों को सहायता दी है और भविष्य में भी सहायता देंगे, लेकिन उन राज्यों ने समय पर उस पैसे का सदुपयोग किया या नहीं, उसे खर्च किया है या नहीं, क्या इसका विवरण सदन में देने का काम करेंगे? साथ ही साथ, मैं एक और सुझाव देना चाहता हूं और सदन में यह जानकारी भी लेना चाहूंगा कि आपके बुलावे पर इन राज्यों ने– जहां यह समस्या है, क्या-क्या भूमिका अपनाई है, क्या आप इसके ऊपर भी ध्यान देने का काम करेंगे? एक अंतिम सुझाव देकर अपनी खत्म कर देना चाहता हूं। चाहे आपका ह्यूमेनिस्टिक अप्रोच हो, किंतु यदि आपकी पुलिस का ह्यूमेनिस्टिक अप्रोच नहीं होगा, आपके प्रशासन का ह्यूमेनिस्टिक अप्रोच नहीं होगा तब तक आपके द्वारा उठाए गए सारे कदम बेकार जाएंगे। एक ओर सेना की ताकत, पुलिस की ताकत का हुक्म मजबूती से दिखाई पड़े और साथ ही साथ उनके लिए एक ऐसी ट्रेनिंग की व्यवस्था की जाए, जिसमें पुलिस और प्रशासन का एक ह्यूमन फेस भी हो। अंत में एक ओर सुझाव देना चाहता हूं, जिस पर अपना विचार करेंगे कि अभी तक जो धर्मवीर पद्मनाभन की अनुशंसाओं को संयुक्त करके, उसमें से जो निचोड़ होगा, उसे लेकर कोई कार्रवाई करेंगे? धन्यवाद।

SHRI R. SHUNMUGASUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I will be very brief. Thank you very much for allowing me to make a very small contribution in an excellent deliberation going on before this august House. Sir, we have given to ourselves a Constitution which has been working very effectively for the last 54 years, and one Article, according to me, which has to be inscribed in golden letters is the Article which guarantees life and protection to every individual, that is, Article 21. Now, we are concerned about our own security and that is being discussed here. How do you differentiate security from the other crimes? When a crime is committed against one individual or a particular group of individuals, it is a mere law and order problem, but when it is localised in a particular community it is called a public order problem and when its effect and consequences are felt inter-State or throughout the country it is a security problem. That is why we are discussing an issue which concerns the whole nation. Sir, I really welcome the positive approach of this Government. The UPA Government has changed its attitude; and it has got a changed attitude in dealing with extremists. Now, they do not have iron hands inside velvet gloves. Their approach to enter into dialogue is an appreciable thing and that will definitely fetch results. My colleague—one of our hon. Members—quoted Thirukkural before this august House. The Thirukkural which starts with *Noynadi Noimudalnadi* that means you go to the problem and correct that problem instead of just trying to cure the after-effects. That is what is expected and

that is what *Thirukkural* also says and that is exactly what this Government and the hon. Home Minister, as he stated yesterday, is doing. Hon. Home Minister, while answering a question regarding Manipur problem yesterday, said that Manipur problem was solved without firing even a single bullet. That exactly is the policy of this Government and that is going to be very fruitful and that is one difference in the approach of this Government from that of earlier Government. Sir, I should thank some of the speakers who have spoken on this issue and have given their deliberations in an excellent manner, especially Shri Vayalar Ravi and Shri Samadani. Shri Vayalar Ravi informed this hon. House that one extremist was changed and became a priest. If a single person can be changed, to that extent also, I think the work of the Government is enough.

Sir, there were certain comments made about the repeal of POTA. POTA repeal was totally misappreciated and misunderstood. Merely by repealing POTA, we have not taken away everything and the Government has not become powerless; the Government is empowered, under the new Act, to proceed against terrorists and the provisions have been incorporated in the new Act. What have been dropped by this Government, while repealing POTA, are the stringent provisions of the Act and, therefore, those comments made about.....(*Time-bell*). Sir, may I take one more minute?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude because you know the mood of the House is that we should conclude now.

SHRI R. SHUNMUGASUNDARAM: Sir, so many comments have been made. I am not going to enter into political issues. So many comments have been made; all the misapprehensions have been expressed. The previous speaker spoke about Veerappan. Dr. Malaisamy also spoke about Veerappan. Veerappan is like a Frankenstein monster, created and an imaginary figure and his activities were blown out of proportion. I would only request the hon. Member, Dr. Malaisamy, to read a book titled, 'Veerappan - The Untold Story', written by Shri Sunadh Ragunath. That gives the real picture. What is the after effect we are seeing is and, now, Justic Sadasiva Commission has been constituted. Several victims, who are victims of rape and policy atrocities, are giving evidence. One person, day before yesterday — it has appeared in the newspapers — has come out to say that 66 persons were killed by policemen and those bodies were buried by him. That person was in policy custody for several years.

He has given evidence. What is the root cause for this? (*Time-bell*) There was no proper handling of the situation. I am not commenting about.....(*Interruption)*

DR. K. MALAISAMY (Tamil Nadu): Is it a case of Mr. Shunmugasundaram that he whole-heartedly supports Veerappan?

SHRI R. SHUNMUGASUNDARAM: I am not yielding.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI R. SHUNMUGASUNDARAM: I am only talking about the attitude of the Government. I would only request the hon. Home Minister that when this approach is likely to be objected by the officials, let him take care of that, let him proceed with this approach. With these words, I conclude.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The debate is concluded....(*Interruptions*) See, the Congress Party's time is over. Each party has exceeded the allocated time. We have already taken six hours for this debate. Somebody has to sacrifice.

श्री राम देव भंडारी (बिहार): उपसभापति जी, मेरा भी नाम था।

श्री उपसभापति: मैंने आपका नाम पुकारा था, आप नहीं थे। I called your name.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, I will take just three, four minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, you will not conclude in three, four minutes....(*Interruptions*).

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: By your watch, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir.

प्रो॰ राम देव भंडारी: उपसभापति जी, मेरा पार्टी का रिप्रैजेंटेशन तो हुआ नहीं है।

श्री उपसभापति: मैंने आपका नाम पुकारा था तो आप नहीं थे।

प्रो॰ राम देव भंडारी: महोदय, मैं थोड़ी देर के लिए चला गया था।

श्री उपसभापति: अच्छा, आप दो-तीन मिनट में कंप्लीट कीजिए।

प्रो॰ राम देव भंडारी: माननीय उपसभापति जी, आन्तरिक सुरक्षा का विषय बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण विषय है। मैं इसे नेशनल इश्यू मानता हूं और ऐसे विषय पर जब चर्चा हो तो पक्ष या विपक्ष की बात नहीं होनी चाहिए बल्कि रचनात्मक रूप से नेशनल इन्टेरेस्ट में चर्चा होनी चाहिए। यूपीए सरकार

को पॉवर में आए हुए कुल 6 महीने हुए हैं। यह इश्यू कोई इस सरकार का इश्यू नहीं है और ना ही किसी पार्टी का इश्यू है। यह सरकार जब पॉवर में आयी, कल मैं सुन रहा था, विरोधी पक्ष के एक सांसद कह रहे थे कि सरकार की विल पावर नहीं है। महोदय, मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि इस सरकार की कितनी विल पॉवर है कि जम्मू-कश्मीर में प्रधानमंत्री गए और उस स्थिति में गए जब आंतकवादियों ने हड्ताल का कॉल किया था ओर विस्फोट कर रहे थे। उस स्थिति में प्रधानमंत्री जी जम्मू-कश्मीर गए और भारी संख्या में लोगों ने उनका स्वागत किया, उनका भाषण सुना। प्रधानमंत्री जी, गृहमंत्री जी नॉर्थ-ईस्ट गए और नार्थ-ईस्ट में उनके जाने के बाद निश्चित रूप से वहां की स्थिति में सुधार हुआ है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस सरकार की पूरी विल पॉवर है और यह सरकार पूरी मजबूती से, जो आन्तरिक सुरक्षा का मामला है, उसका समाधान करने जा रही है। महोदय, देश के 9 राज्यों में नक्सलवाद की समस्या है । बिहार में भी नक्सलवाद की समस्या है और बिहार सरकार पूरी मजबूती से इस समस्या समाधान कर रही है, सख्ती से कार्रवाई कर रही है, उन लोगों के खिलाफ, जो बिहार में हिंसात्मक कार्रवाई कर रहे हैं। मगर, महोदय, हम नेपाल की सीमा पर रहते हैं और इस समय नेपाल में माओवादी आन्दोलन हो रहा है और निश्चित रूप से उसका प्रभाव बिहार पर भी पड़ता है। इसलिए बिहार जैसे राज्यों में जहां नक्सली गतिविधियां हो रही हैं, केन्द्र सरकार को विशेष ध्यान देना पड़ेगा और बिहार सरकार द्वारा जो भी मांग की जाती रही है, चाहे स्पेशल फोर्सेज़ की मांग हो या इसको दबाने के लिए आर्थिक सहायता की मांग हो, केन्द्र सरकार को इस विषय पर निश्चित रूप से सोचना चाहिए। महोदय, मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि यूपीए की सरकार, जिसने बहुत ही गंभीरता से और बहुत ही संजीदगी से इस विषय को लिया है और सदन की चर्चा में भी यह विषय आया है, निश्चित रूप से यूपीए सरकार को इस दिशा में जो सफलता मिली है, आगे भी वह सफलता मिलती रहेगी। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ, मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूं।

श्री उपसभापति: धन्यवाद, आपने बराबर तीन मिनटों का समय लिया इसी तरह से आप तीन मिनटों में खत्म करते रहिए।

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I will not wait for your time-bell to go. I am from Jammu and Kashmir; I have so many facts and figures available with me but I want to inform this august House, and, I want to assert the fact that despite the terrorist acts, day in and day out, in Jammu and Kashmir, the graph of normalcy is on the ascendancy.

I will not quote the figures as to how many people went for *Amarnath Yatra*, or *Vaishno Devi*, and, as to how the tourism has picked up in a very big way, but I want to tell you a personal experience. Hon. Prime Minister went there, hon. Home Minister went there, and, a number of people came to meet them. Earlier, we were begging the people to come forward and meet the Ministers from the Centre.

But, here was an occasion when the hon. Home Minister went there, and, so many people, so many delegations came forward. Sir, that is the level of normalcy there in Jammu and Kashmir. I want to assert further that the army, the para-military forces, the people, and, the Government, all are fighting terrorists, and, soon there will be an occasion when there will be no room for any cross-border insurgency.

But, here and now, I raise a point for Mr. Arun Shourie, who is not here, and for Mr. Arun Jaitley. I wish Mr. Shourie were as much serious -- he is sincere, I don't doubt his integrity and sincerity -- but he was not serious. I want to tell this House that two months ago, he published articles ....(*Interruptions*). He should have been here. He published these articles two months ago and yesterday and today, the same paper has carried the same thing. And, when he spoke here, he said the same thing -- the madrassas without addresses, the Bangladeshi problem. If they are serious enough, both the gentlemen should give notice to the Chairman, investigate, organise the discussion and give us details. But, like the Shiv Sena Member yesterday, you cannot quote electoral rolls, voting lists, etc. here. That is not an authentic document. So, on Bangladeshi issue, we are as much serious as Mr. Arun Shourie. But, there should be a proper notice and a proper discussion. And, that Government and this Government will investigate once you give authentic documents. This Report of the Task Force, Mr. Deputy Chairman, was available with the NDA Government. They didn't discuss; they didn't take this august House into confidence; they neither accepted nor rejected that. Now, after that Government has gone, they are showing us this task force. As I have promised, I have not to take more time. I want this House to consider what the hon. Minister said, and what is my opinion also. We do not want to lower guard. We have to fight cross-border insurgency and fight terrorism to the best of our ability. We are not lowering the guard. So, why this hulla-gulla? Why these articles, and why lots of these misleading statements on the floor of the House? Therefore, guard has not to be lowered. Terrorism has to be fought. That is the will of the nation. On that, there is no question of compromise by this Government. That is what was the spirit of the Home Minister's speech once again bring another statement of the hon. Home Minister for your analysis. Please understand that. He wants to fight terrorism. He is not lowering the guard. Yesterday Shivraj said that he wanted to understand the anger of the youth. We have to go into that. We

are a democracy. I want to remind you that the hon. Prime Minister went abroad to Europe, to America and to ASEAN. We are not praised abroad for the stringent laws that you made --POTA, etc. We are only recognised and praised throughout the world for our democracy, for our commitment to Secularism, for our commitment to pluralism. That makes India great. And, the speeches of this kind lower India's prestige. We can be united only when you make India great, when you give proposals for national integration. You created a division within the House and outside society. Therefore, we cannot agree with you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, conclude. Otherwise, I have to ring the bell. You promised that you would not take much time.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I will finish within two minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, you have already taken more time. ...(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, if you want the silence of the graveyard, that will not make India strong. India will become strong only when there is transparency, when we strengthen our democracy, when we become truly secular, and when we honour and commit ourselves to pluralism. So, I want to tell the BJP Members particularly, do not think that your speeches can make India united and great. You have to understand India has a vitality within and that vitality was searched and discovered by Allama Iqbal. I will next time circulate in this House the Translation of the poem. I pay tribute to Mr. Samadani, who mentioned about Shivala. Actually there is a poem by Allama Iqbal, Naya Shivala. "Let us make a new temple of hope for the nation, for unity of the nation, for communal harmony of the nation". This is the message of Naya Shivala. I must end here. I wish Mr. Arjun Jaitley and Mr. Arun Shourie were here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You forbid me to ring the bell. ...(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I will conclude on just a couplet from Allama Iqbal...(*Interruptions*). Yes, Mr. Arun Shourie is not here. I wish he had come. Anyway, in fact, BJP has to reinvent itself and Mr. Arun Shourie and Mr. Arun Jaitley could help BJP to do that. Sir, this couplet is very relevant to this discussion. There is something strong in India, in India's vitality.

Therefore, Allama Iqbal said in this poem.

†-यूनान-ओ-मिस्र-ओ-रोमा, सब मिट गए जहां से, It is the Indian civilisation that is thriving. यूनान-ओ-मिस्र-ओ-रोमा, सब मिट गए जहां से, बाकी मगर है अब तक नामो निशां हमारा। और one more verse. कुछ बात है कि हस्ती मिटती नहीं हमारी, सदियों रहा है दुश्मन दौरे जमां हमारा। (व्यवधान)

یونان ومصر وروما سب مٹ گئے جہاں سے

یونان ومصر وروما سب مٹ گئے جہاں سے
باقی مگر ہے اب تک نام و نشاں ہمارا

کچھ بات ہے کہ ہستی مٹتی نہیں ہماری
صدیوں رہا ہے دشمن دورِ زماں ہمارا

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Home Minister. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI R.S. GAVAI: Sir, it is parliamentary propriety. When Mr. Arun Shourie initiated the debate, then it becomes his bounden duty to be present here to hear.. (*Interruptions*) It is parliamentary propriety. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chair cannot give direction and tell the Members to be present here. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Sir, it is they who wanted the discussion in this House. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is all right. But the Chair cannot tell Members which Member should be present and when he will have to be present (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: But the courtesy demands..(*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: He raised the discussion and he is not here. (*Interruptions*)

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: उपसभापति जी, प्रोपराइटी का जो प्रश्न उन्होंने उठाया, वह बहुत वैलिड है, बहुत वैध है। हमारे सदन की परम्परा है कि जो भी व्यक्ति डिस्कशन इनिशिएट करता है, वह उस समय सदन में जरूर रहता है, जिस समय मंत्री जवाब देते हैं।.(व्यवधान)..

प्रो॰ सैफुद्दीन सोज: बस इतना ही कहिए...(व्यवधान)... बहुत खूबसूरत है ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: ठहरिए, सोज साहब, प्लीज।

---

†Transliteration of Urdu Script.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: सर, ये तो जवाब भी नहीं देने देते। पता नहीं इनको क्या हो जाता है? ..(व्यवधान)..

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi is also not present. (*Interruptions*) This is the main opposition party. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, they are not serious about the problem. (*Interruptions*)

श्री उपसभापति: आप सुनिए।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: सर, यह चर्चा पिछले मंगलवार शुरू हुई थी। किसी को मालूम नहीं था कि यह चर्चा आगे आज तक जाएगी या अनिश्चितता में लटकती रहेगी। आज उनकी पत्नी की तबीयत खराब है। उन्होंने पर्सनल पत्र, मुझे लगता है, शायद शिवराज जी को लिखा है, देखिए। उन्होंने तो भी प्रोपरायटी निभायी और उन्होंने यह कहा कि मैं उनको पत्र लिखकर जाता हूं और पत्र लिखकर गये हैं कि मैं इस कारण से नहीं आ पा रहा हूं। मंगलवार के बाद अगर बुधवार को भी चर्चा समाप्त होती, वीरवार को भी होती, उन्होंने अपना कार्यक्रम ऐसा रखा था। वह यहां निश्चित रहते, लेकिन वे यहां जिस कारण से नहीं हैं, उस कारण का भी बाकायदा पत्र लिखकर शिवराज जी को कह कर गए हैं कि यह वजह है, जिसके कारण मुझे जाना पड़ रहा है। वे कोचीन में, अपनी बीमार पत्नी को लेकर गए हैं।

श्री उपसभापति: ठीक है।

गृह मंत्री (श्री शिवराज वी॰ पाटिल): श्रीमन्, मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि अरुण शौरी जी ने मुझे टेलीफोन पर बताया कि उनकी पत्नी की तबीयत अच्छी नहीं है, इसलिए वे बाहर जा रहे हैं और कहा कि क्या मेरी परमिशन है? मैंने कहा कि आप जरूर जाइए, अगर ऐसी हालत में नहीं रहे तो कोई बात नहीं है। मैं इतना ही सबसे पहले बतलाना चाहता हूं।

[MR. CHAIRMAN *in the Chair*]

Sir, I would like to thank the Chair, the hon. Chairman and your goodself, for allowing this debate to take place in this House, and allowing six hours for the Members to express their views.

Sir, but for your help and your assistance, this debate could not have taken place in this manner. Enough time was given to the hon. Members and all the Members have expressed their views, I should say in a very candid manner. Excepting for a few points made by the Members sitting on both the sides, I did not find any partisan attitude and this is most healthy and this is most welcome.

2.00 P.M.

I would like to express, at the very outset, my thanks to the Hon. Members for having made very good points and having made those points in a non-partisan manner. Mr. Arun Shourie had made a very long and good speech.

I knew that it was not possible for me to reply to each of the points which he had raised and that is why on that day itself, I had said that I would like to reply to the points made by the hon. Member in writing and I did prepare a write-up and that write-up has been circulated to the Members and we have circulated some other papers also which give only the statistics and figures and no write-ups. I hope that these documents which have been given to the Members would help all of us to come to the correct conclusions on the security situation in the country.

The first point which I would like to take up is the report of the Subramaniurn Committee. After the Kargil War, Subramanium Committee was appointed and a report was given. That report is a bulky report and so, the Government of that time had appointed a Group of Ministers to look into that report, and even for the Group of Ministers, it was not possible to go into all the intricacies on their own. So, they had appointed task forces and those task forces have given the report. What is written in the report given by the task forces is a secret information and that has not be divulged. But what was decided by the Group of Ministers is not secret and that has been circulated to the Ministries for action. I am very happy to point out that when this point was made by Mr. Arun Shourie, the Leader of the Opposition was here in the House and he did get up and say that nearly 95 per cent of the recommendations given by the Group of Ministers have been acted upon, have been implemented and I had no difficulty in getting up and saying that even 5 per cent recommendations which remained unimplemented, would certainly be implemented by the Government because they are good recommendations and we have no difficulty in implementing them.

Sir, in newspapers and everywhere and sometimes in political groups, it is said that the security situation has worsened. Now, how do we come to the conclusion whether the security situation has worsened or has improved? It is not on the basis of one or two incidents taking place at one or two places that we come to that conclusion. India is a very big country

of nearly one billion people and at many places, incidents do take place. They did take place in the past, they do take place now and, unfortunately, they may take place in the future also. Is it possible for us to come to the conclusion on the basis of one or two incidents here and there that the situation has improved or the situation has worsened? I would like to submit that this is not the kind of criteria which can be adopted to come to that conclusion. The criteria which can be adopted is to compare the facts and figures of a particular period of time with the facts and figures of the corresponding time of the years gone by, and then come to the conclusion whether the situation has improved or deteriorated. The second thing which can be done is to compare the facts and figures of our country with the facts and figures of other countries and find out whether the situation has improved or deteriorated. Now, that's the kind of thing which we have to do. Now, when we say that the situation has improved, we are not saying that the situation has become totally normal. That is not the assertion we have made at any place. We are not saying it on the floor of the House also. What we are saying is that the situation in certain areas has improved, situation in Jammu and Kashmir and situation in North-Eastern States has improved. That is the kind of statement we have made. Now, it may not be very necessary for me to give a long list of facts and figures as to what has been happening in Jammu and Kashmir and in the North-Eastern States, to justify the statement of the Government on the floor of this House. Very briefly, I can say that the infiltration in Jammu and Kashmir has come down by 60 per cent. And again, I would like to answer the question raised by one hon. Member here as to how we can say that it has come down by 60 per cent or it is less than 60 per cent or more than 60 per cent. Now, that is a point to be considered. If we were relying upon the figures given in the past, we should also rely upon the figures given today by the same agency. Now, a kind of mechanism which is used for collecting these figures is to examine the interceptions which are done. We have the agencies which collect the information, and the figures which are available with different agencies, are taken together, and then, they come to the conclusion. I would not say that there is no mistake at all. But I would say that these figures are reliable; they are as reliable as they were in the past. I am sorry to say that some hon. Members in the House tried to say that the figures given by the Chief of the Army Staff, figures given by the Defence Ministry, figures given by the Defence Minister, figures given by the Home Ministry and the figures given by the Home Minister are

different. Now, the other day, the hon. Defence Minister was present in this House, and fortunately, on that day, I was also sitting here, and while replying to one of the questions, the Defence Minister had said that the infiltration in September was a little less than the infiltration in October. That is the kind of statement he had made. But that statement was twisted, that statement was presented in the House and outside the House in a manner to show that the Defence Minister has said that the infiltration figures have gone up, and the Defence Minister or the Home Minister or the Home Ministry is saying that. That is not true. It has come down. It would be better if this type of statements are avoided. This does not lead us to anywhere. It creates terror. Terror is not created only by using the guns. I have already said this thing. Terror can be created by circulating wrong information, rumours, misinterpreting the facts and misinterpreting the figures in such a fashion that the people start fearing, people get terrorised, and think that the situation is not improving. Rather, the situation is disturbing. My humble requet to the responsible Members of this House is that, in order to have the pleasure of showing that we are not coming up to the mark, if you are misinterpreting the figures or the statements, that is not in the interest of the country. The number of incidents in Jammu and Kashmir has come down by 24 per cent, killings have come down by 12 per cent, and the number of people visiting Jammu and Kashmir, I was told, has gone up by two-times or three-times. The number of pilgrims going to Amar Nath and Vaishno Devi temple has also gone up. I was told that in the previous years, the number of pilgrims visiting these holy places was one lakh or so. But this year, the number has gone up to four lakhs. Now, these are the figures which certainly indicate that the situation in Jammu and Kashmir is improving. But I would say that it has not totally improved. The terrorists over there have changed their tactics. They have changed their *modus operandi*. They are now throwing the grenades, using the mines and using the improvised explosive devices. They are now attacking politicians and the policemen. Now, this is something about which we have to be careful, and we will certainly be careful. What is the situation in the North-East? In the North-East, the number of incidents has come down by 22 per cent; the killings of the security forces have come down by 7 per cent and the killings of the civilians have come down by 26 per cent. Now, these figures indicate that the situation is improving. Here also, the situation has become normal. We are saying that the situation is improving. It has to be borne in mind that the situation in

Mizoram which used to be a disturbed area, has become normal; in Meghalaya, it is normal; in Arunachal Pradesh, it is normal, and in Manipur, it is not very disturbing. In Assam, some incidents have taken place. In Tripura, some incidents have taken place. In Mizoram, the situation was brought down to normalcy through talks. One or two Members sitting here did refer to the efforts made by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. Probably, Dr. Alexander was helping him at that time; I do not have an idea about that. The situation has become normal. The Congress Government was there; the Congress Chief Minister was asked to step down; Mr. Laldenga was asked to take over, and the situation became normal. Today also, the situation continues to be normal. In respect of Nagaland, the talks did take place within the country and outside the country. When the talks took place within the country and outside the country, people did object to that kind of talks. They said, "Why should the talks take place with the people who are asking for separation outside the country?" But talks did take place. And because of those talks, for the last seven years, the situation in Nagaland has been peaceful except for the two bomb incidents which took place a few months back. Now, this has to be borne in mind. I am not saying, Sir, that the situation is totally normal and we can just sleep on our oath and say that we have to do nothing, everything is all right. That is not our stand. I appreciate the caution which is given by Dr. Alexander and many other Members, that the situation is not such that we can lower our guard and say, "Nothing more has to be done." We will keep that caution in our mind. Every moment we are doing our duty.

As far as the Naxalite problem is concerned, what is the situation concerning the Naxalite activities? Mr. Arun Shourie when he made a statement over here had quoted some figures. He did say that from less than one hundred, the number of districts affected had gone up to 157. Sir, this is, probably, not the correct way of quoting the figures. There was some mistake. Probably, he was not having correct information; he was just jumping to the conclusion that the Naxalite activities in the State have jumped up to the number of 157 districts in six months' time. That has not happened in six month's time. In 2001, it was 131 districts; in 2003, it had gone up to 143, and in 2004, this number had gone up to 157. The number is increasing; there is no doubt about it. Sir, the number is increasing, and that causes concern to us. We should be alert on that. He was right in saying that we should have to be careful. Dr. Alexander was also right in

saying that we should have to be careful. In fact, he could have spoken on many other issues concerning the security, but he did concentrate only on the Naxalite activities in India, and it is really very useful. I would say that the number has gone up, but it has not gone up only in six months' time; it has gone up in three years' time. That has to be borne in mind. Which are the States affected by the Naxalite acitivities? Lalu Prasadji is here; he knows that area like the palm of his hand, and he will endorse what I am saying here. Andhra Pradesh is affected; Maharashtra's few districts adjoining Andhra Pradesh are affected; Orissa is affected Chhattisgarh is affected; Jharkhand is affected; Bihar is affected; some districts in U.P. are also affected; some districts in Chhattisgarh are affected, and as was stated by Dr. Alexander yesterday, it appears that this is spreading to some areas in Karnataka and Kerala also, the forest areas and the hilly areas. We shall have to be careful about it. But if we analyse the statistics of the incidents, the killings and the movements of the Naxalite outfits in this area, we come to the conclusion that the number of incidents and the number of killings in Andhra Pradesh has gone down like anything.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH (**Andhra Pradesh**): Who has submitted this information to you? Is this information submitted by your party Government there?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Last year's information is with us and this year's information is also with us. In the last year, in a period of six months, 52 killings had taken place. It has come down to only 2 this year. It has come down to only 2 after these talks were started. Maybe, these talks are difficult; maybe, the ultimate result would be, we shall have to wait and see what happens. But the fact of the matter is that the killings have come down from 52 to 2. This is something about which we need not be sorry.

In Orissa also, something very terrible happened. A few police stations were raided and weapons were taken away. But the number of killings and incidents in Orissa has also come down. In UP, there are some diffculties in respect of the law and order situation. But the Naxalite activities are not that terrible. In Uttaranchal, there are some difficulties and there are some reports about the people who are coming from across the border into that area. But there also the situation has not gone out of control. The States where the Naxalite activities have been difficult to tackle are Chhattisgarh,

Jharkhand and Bihar and some parts of Maharashtra. These are the areas where we shall have to concentrate. One of the methods which we are adopting is to concentrate.

Yesterday, I had said that I shall have to reply to the statement made by Dr. Alexander on the floor of the House because we have learnt a bit of administration from him. I must say this on the floor of the House and we look to him with great respect. We don't take his statements very lightly. He had stated one or two things. I had some difficulty in accepting what he was saying then. At that time, I got up and explained certain things and I had said that ultimately while speaking on the floor of the House, I would give the explanation.

Sir, he was reading the document which we had circulated to the Members. I would like to read that document and I would like to explain what it means. It should not have been interpreted in the manner in which it was done. It says "If in its assessment a State finds the conditions conducive, it may hold peace talks with the Naxal groups". It is left to the State Governments to decide whether there are conditions in which the talks can be held or not. We are giving this liberty to them. What does it again say? It says, "in any manner decides to do so". The manner of talks has to be decided by the State Government. But I am sorry to say that along with this "in any manner", one or two words were added, that is, "on anything". This document does not say "on anything". It talks about the manner in which the talks have to be held. Now, we have left it to the State Government to decide whether the retired officers should talk or whether the officers in service should talk or whether the Ministers should talk or whether it should be a Group of Ministers who would talk or whether the academicians should participate. Let them decide it in the manner they want to do. We have not said any "on anything" they want to do. Then we have given the parameters within which the talks have to be held. The purpose of the talks should be to strengthen peace. The purpose of the talks should be to strengthen peace and tranquillity and reduce the reliance of Naxal grouped on armed struggle.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, that was only to comply with the commitment that you had made to the Naxalites to fight the elections in Andhra Pradesh. It was not to restore peace. It is only to comply with commitment that you had given to Naxalites prior to the election. That is

how you had colluded with these people to bring down the Chandrababu Naidu's Government.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, please give me permission to respond to queries, if they are put after I conclude my reply, not in between. I don't want to break my link.

Sir, what is the purpose? The purpose is to strengthen peace and tranquillity. One should not forget the emphasis on peace and tranquillity. There are a group of persons who are saying that arms struggle alone can be effective. On the other hand, the entire society is saying, "You shall have to depend on election; you shall have to depend on discussion; you shall have to depend on the institutions which we have built over, instead of using bullets and guns." Time and again, I have said, "With bullets and guns, nobody will achieve anything substantial. But with discussion and talks, you will be able to achieve a lot." Now, with bullets and guns, you can kill some persons. You can kill the Home Minister, if you like. But you cannot achieve anything more than that. If you have to achieve something very substantial, you shall have to come to the table for talks. Only then you will be able to achieve what you want. Our country is not so weak. The State Governments are not weak. And if anybody is taking guns in hands and trying to say that he can achieve a lot with guns, he is wrong. At the same time, I am saying, "If they are wrong, we are not going to treat them as enemies. We are going to treat them...(*Interruptions*) At the fag-end, you seek your clarifications. I will try my best to answer then. Please don't disturb me now.

The approach that we are telling them is, "You have to reduce your reliance on weapons." Now, does that mean some dependence on weapons will be allowed? That is not the case. When can you end reliance of a person on a weapon? If you kill him, that is the end. If you have a war, that may be useful. But, in one go, we don't have a magic wand to see that they give up their reliance on arms and weapons. Yes; gradually you shall have to move towards a situation in which they will give up relying on arms, and they will believe in discussion, dialogue and democratic system. This is exactly what we were saying. Any why did we say this to the State Governments? Again there are one or two things which I will read and then I will explain the approach which we have tried to evolve. "During the period of peace-dialogue, the State would continue to perform its legal duties" —

they have to continue to perform their legal duties—"and the stepped up presence of the State machinery in the affected areas. They have to strengthen the machinery over there, and they have to perform their legal duties." That means even when the talks are going on, the State machinery is not withdrawn. Everything is not given up. But everything is allowed to continue. And, it should continue. Then the States should consult each other and pursue a coordinated approach and conduct peace-dialogue in a manner that it does not impact on the other States adversely." Now, here, to States of Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh and Bihar, we have been saying, "Please, put your heads together, join your hands, evolve a policy, and you adopt it. Whatever policy you adopt, we will help you. If you want us to bring about this kind of coordination, it is possible for us to do it. And this is exactly why a meeting was held at Hyderabad, and where the Chief Ministers were requested to come. The Home Ministers came; three Chief Ministers came. But when the meeting was convened there, three Chief Ministers came; one Chief Minister was not there, the other Chief Minister could not have come, and the third Chief Minister did write a letter saying, "You take a decision; we will follow that decision." Now this point was presented to the people in such a fashion that the Chief Ministers were unwilling to come. But the fact of the matter is that they were not only invited, but they were talking to the Home Minister in Delhi. They were talking to the Home Minister on telephone. And we wanted that all the people, who were responsibe for taking the decision, should come together. When we went there and asked them, they did come there in order to show that that meeting was not important. What was emphasised upon, what was underlined was as to how many Chief Ministers attended the meeting. And that line was taken even on the floor of this House, to indicate that meeting was not important. On the one hand, you expect the Chief Ministers to come together and evolve a policy and, on the other hand, when there is a meeting of Chief Ministers, you present that meeting in such a fashion that the validity and effectiveness of that meeting is reduced and your point of view is protected. It may be good tactics of the Opposition to criticise the ruling party; but is it also not good tactics of any party to provide solution to the problem which our country is facing? This is exactly what I want to say on this point. And then, we have said that the States should modernise their police forces and improve Intelligence gathering mechanism to take and sustain an effective police action wherever the possibility of peace dialogue does not

exist. I would like to ask: is this policy wrong? How do you want us to treat the boys and girls who are in forests and tribal areas, who do not get jobs, who do not, at times, get food, who do not have shelter, who do not have medical facilities? With their open eyes, they watch the world around them and they see that others are living differently. And if they become angry, not because of Naxalites, or, any ill-will towards anybody, but because of their own situation, and if they take arms in their hands and start Naxalite activities, what role should the Government play?

Sir, you have dealt with this and I know how you have dealt with this. You have given them affection and love; you have understood their problems. And after that also, when results were not allowed to be produced by some, you did take action against them. I think that is a correct policy. I think that is the policy the Government would like to follow. I think that is the policy the State Governments should follow. They are not somebody who have come from outside; they are not somebody who have come from the stars and planets or other countries. They are born here; they are brought up here. How can you treat them as enemies and, at the first instance itself, start firing bullets and say that this is the way we would like to deal with you?

We want to deal with them as the '*karta*' of the family. And the *karta* of the family will punish the child if his advice is not respected. But the Karta of the family will not lift his hand against the child at the first instance itself, without talking to him, without trying to understand him. What is wrong in this? I do not see anything wrong in this. And people are saying, "Why do you talk".

And we, who are sitting here on the Treasury Benches today, know the efficacy of talking. The Punjab issue was very difficult; it was dealt with. Dr. Alexander was there in the Government. It was dealt with in a proper manner. We did use the forces in Punjab. There is no doubt about it. But it was not the forces only that were used. Let us not forget that the Longowal Accord was also entered into to solve the Punjab problem. And I was one of those who had gone to Punjab, along with Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad, to find out whether elections should take place, when the extremist activity was at its peak. And we came back and told our leader, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, the Prime Minister at that time, that elections should be held. Elections were held. The other parties got elected. They were allowed to come to

power. Talks with Longowalji took place and we did not take the stand that you did not belong to us. We took the stand that you were one of this family; we are members of this family. And that problem was solved. In Mizoram, the same thing happened. In Nagaland, the same thing happened. I know what the problem in Maharashtra was. The problem in Tamil Nadu was one of language; in Maharashtra, it was that of unilingual State. There was an occasion when firing was resorted to and some people had died. But that is not the only way in which we have dealt with problems. But the talks did take place and decisions were taken and the problem was solved. I am trying to understand from you how we committed any wrong, any blunder in starting the talks with them. We have been telling our friends that don't break the talks simply on some precedural ground, you go to the substantive. Ultimately, if you come to the conclusion that the talks are not going to yield any reslults, you are free to act. Some friends from Chhattisgarh and Jharkhand had come to me, and they said that we don't think that the talks will help us. We said, 'We leave it to you to decide.' If you have to decide and take action, you will find us standing by your side, giving you all the help. But ulitimately, you shall have to decide because there are some of the problems which have to be dealt with by the State Governments. If employment has to be given; if a road has to be constructed, if food for work has to be given-even the assistance is given by the Union Government-it has to go through the State Governments, it has to risk through the State Governments, and they shall have to do it. If you think that these methods are not going to be useful, then adopt any methods you like. We have given them this liberty.

Sir, on this point, I would like to make one statement. We were told—and very rightly.—I don't quarrel with that kind of a statement —that law and order is the primary responsibility of the State Governments. Primary responsibility, very correctly described. When it evolves into terrorism, probably, the responsiblity of the State Governments recedes into the background and the responsibility of the Union Government increases. When it escalates into a war, a bigger thing, then, the responsibility of the Union Government is primary and most important and not that of the State Government. That does not mean that the State Governments will not help the Union Government to fight a war; that does not mean that the State Governments will not be helped by the Union Government when they are trying to deal with ordinary crimes in thier States. Now, here, sir, the

responsibility is joint. Sometimes, it is done separately; sometimes it is done jointly. One should understand that the Union Government, not today, but in the past, before the previous Government, and the Governments before that also, have been helping the State Governments to deal with the terrorist activities that are taking place. Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir, North-Eastern States, Assam, wherever it was necessary, the forces were sent by the Union Government to the State Governments on their demand, at their instance. They were given the intelligence; they were given the funds; they were given the equipment and the same thing we would like to do. But, would you expect us to say to the State Government, even though you are elected, even though you have a Chief Minister, a Home Minister and Ministers over there, please believe this that we are going to come there and manage it. Would you expect us to do it? Would you expect the DG, CRPF here to give orders to the DG, State Police and say that your orders will be taken? The difficulty did arise in some States. It arose in Jammu and Kashmir and the Unified Headquarters was created over there. In the Unified Headquarters, Army, the paramilitary forces and the State police are sitting there and that is presided over by a civilian Chief Minister who is hearing their advice, and then giving them the direction as to what has to be done. This is being done in Assam; this is being done in Manipur; this may be done in Nagaland, and in other areas also. Now, here, we are, certainly, cooperating with it. I have here with me the constitution, but I would not like to go into the constitutional provisions and quote you the entries in the Seventh Schedule, the Concurrent List, the State List and the Union List and say that these are the parameters within which the Union Government has to work legality because the Members sitting here are quite senior and they all know what are the areas, what is the jurisdiction under which the State Government has to work. The explanation given by the hon. Member who spoke at the fag end of the debate is correct. At no time we had said that it is not our responsibility and it is the responsibility of the State Government. Please don't misquote us. If any statement is made by any responsible person in the Government, show it to us. I am not saying that you will depend on what appears in the media. The media people may be writing it. They may hear it fully, or, they may not hear it fully. According to their understanding they may. I am not blaming them. But what you should rely upon is the statement made by the Ministers on the floor of the House or any notification issued by the Government to say that it is the State Government and State Government alone, and we have

no responsibility. We are not saying this. We are not going to say this. We are allowing the State Governments to play their role and we have decided to help them in whatever manner they want the Union Government to help them. And, please, let there not be any confusion in the mind that the Union Government is shirking its responsibility of helping the State Government to maintain State's law and order. It is not. If it were, we would not have gone to Hyderabad to talk to them. I will explain to you the mechanism that is available in the Home Ministry today. We have a Special Security Secretary here. The responsibility given to the Special Security Secretary is to talk to the DIGs and other officers in the naxalite-affected States every month or two months or whenever it is necessary, and decide as to what has to be done. This mechanism is already there. Probably, it is not known to the hon. Members because it is an internal matter that we are doing.

Then there is a committee which is presided over by the Home Secretary who talks to the Chief Secretaries of the States and DIGs of the States and they decide as to how the policy should be evolved to deal with the naxalite activity or the terrorist activities in Jammu and Kashmir or the terrorist activities in the North Eastern States. and, then, there are regional committees of the Home Minister and the Chief Ministers who meet periodically to decide about the policies. And, then, the Chief Ministers have been talking to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister every now and then, whenever they want. There is coordination. There is institution for coordination. You don't think that we are not talking.

Now, the complaint is not coming from the Chief Ministers of the States whether they belong to the congress party or the non-Congress parties. The complaints is coming from some media persons or some persons who are talking outside. Because, probably, they are not acquainted with the fact that there are institutions, there are timely meetings, and that is why there is no scope to say that there is no coordination. If better coordination is required, and if you give us some suggestion, we will accept it. We will respect your suggestions. If something more has to be done, we will certainly do it.

There was a suggestion given that let there be a unified command in the North Eastern States. There are difficulties and the experts know what are those difficulties. If any suggestion of this kind is given to us, we will

examine it and we will then speak about it. This much about the naxalites.

Sir, I am very happy to find that many Members, in the name of Jay Prakash Narayanji or the great leaders in the past, have said that the terrorism or militancy is not to be controlled or tackled only with the help of guns and they have said that the economic production should increase; and, not only production, but economic justice also should be done. I have spoken about it. It is exactly for this reason the Prime Minister did go to Jammu and said, "24,000 crores of rupees will be spent in Jammu and Kashmir in building railways, in building highways, in building power plants, in building irrigation projects, and in giving help to the traders, to the industrialists, to the educationalists." If you require the details, I can just hand over to you in the written form. I am not going in to all these.

It is exactly for this reason, Sir, the North Eastern Council is there, created not by us, but by the previous Government, and it is countinuing. it has helped. One of the decisions which has been taken with respect to the North Eastern States is that the frunds which are given to them annually are non-lapsable. Once they are given, they will remain with them. They shall have to use it. In the North Eastern States also, what is being done, very shortly I would like to put before the House. We are building railways which will go up to Imphal. We are building a national highway. We are building international highways which will go from India to Myanmar and to other countries also. We are building irrigation projects. We are building power projects, mini-hydel power projects, medium hydel power projects and the big hydel power projects. We are taking over the educational institutions not in the name of administration but giving funds to them, and creating universities, central universities and we are eatablishing institutions which will protect the cultural aspects of the people over there. The culture there is very rich. It is ancient. They love it and we want that it should prosper over there. This is the kind of thing we are going to do. Sir, in the Home Ministry also many things are done, I need not go into all those, but I will just keep it. Social harmony is the most important thing. One of the points which was made by Shri Anand Sharma and I was awe struck by the way in which he presented that point. He said that if you want the security of the country to be intact and if at the same time, if you see that there are communal disturbances in the society, then what would happen? I am not going to refer to the incidents that are going to happen because that will unnecessarily create acrimony in the society, but did they take

place in the country or not? Did they kill thousands of people or not? Did they affect the internal security or not? Let us introspect and let us speak to ourselves. So, communal harmony is necessary. If you don't have communal harmony, I won't say that it will be difficult to maintain law and order. Even then we will maintain it. We have confidence in ourselves. We have confidence in our officers. We have confidence in our Forces. More than that, we have confidence in the understanding of the people themselves who love peace and who love communal harmony. We have confidence in them. We will do it, and yet, I would say that if somebody is out to disturb communal harmony he is not helping to maintain internal security in the country which can escalate into a danger to the sovereignty and country's unity also. That has to be understood and I am very grateful to Mr. Anand Sharma. Specially, when he finished, I just congratulated him for this point. I did not say it as a formality, I felt it, and I said it and I want to repeat it. Sir, in some areas the internal security is disturbed of ethnicity. Sometimes, tribes have their own pride and they value their culture and that also created some disturbances. I think that matter has to be handled in a delicate manner, with understanding. Sir, we have decided to have a law which will stop communal disturbances. I am saying it on the floor of the House. The paper is ready. We have submitted it to the Law Ministry and the Law Ministry is in the process of drafting a Bill. After the Bill is drafted, we will put it on the Internet and we will ask for the comments from the Hon. Members of this House, the other House, the legislators and the media persons and the academicians and the people at large and that law will define what is 'communal disturbance'. The law will provide for investigation. That law will provide for speedy decision of the cases and that law will provide for the compensation that would be given. That law will also provide for the measures which would be taken to prevent communal disturbances. This is the kind of thing which we are trying to do. Sir, I do not have to labour on this point greatly. Today, only in the morning, we had a discussion on the modernisation of the police forces and I must say with great respect to the Members over there that they made wonderful points and we are going to act upon all those points. Now, one of the points which was made that funds which are given for the modernisation of the paramilitary forces and the State's forces are not sufficient and I am also of the same view. We are giving a lot of funds to our Defence Forces and I know that we should give more money to our Defence Froces also because their responsibility is more onerous. There they do not have to discharge their

responsibility everyday but their responsibility is more onerous. I know it personally that they should get more money. But then, what is happening in this world and one of the Members on the floor of the House did say that the individual crime should not be compared with terrorist activities and terrorism is a kind of low intensity war and if it is becoming a low intensity war and if our neighbours have developed the philosophy under which they say that one day's expenditure on war can be utilised for five years activity in a neighbouring country, we shall have to be careful about it.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: And we shall have to spend more money on our forces. We have decided to expand our paramilitary forces. We have decided – of course, it was decided by the previous Government, I will give credit to them and I am not saying that they had not done anything -- to add 209 more battalions to the paramilitary forces. We want to give more battalions to the State Governments. I think, we are thinking of giving 56 higher battalions to States.

Now, I come to the modernisation of police...

श्री सभापति : कितना समय लेंगे आप? लालू जी को नींद आ रही है।

(रेल मंत्री) **श्री लालू प्रसाद**: हमसे सीनियर-सीनियर लोग सो रहे हैं।

श्री सभापति : आप खुद सो रहे हैं।

श्री एस॰ एस॰ अहलुवालिया (झारखंड): अब सीनियर हो गए।

श्री सभापति : चलिए, जल्दी खत्म कीजिए,नहीं तो यादव जी सो जाएंगे।

श्री लालू प्रसाद : हम नहीं सोएंगे सर। हम जग कर आए है।

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, internal security of the country has been discussed for six hours.

श्री सभापति : चलिए, चलिए, .. इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि लालू जी सो रहे थे। मैंने कहा कि आप ज्यादा बोल लेंगे तो यादव जी सो जाएंगे और मेरे लिए समस्या खड़ी हो जाएगी।

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: My apologies to my friends over here, if I am boring them. I am just discharging my duty. I do not know when this kind of discussion would take place again. I am coming to the fag end of my reply .....*(Interruptions)*...

श्री लालू प्रसाद : आप बोलिए ना, आप बोलिए।

श्री सभापति : ठीक है।

श्री लालू प्रसाद : आप कहाँ पड़ गए।

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Let us hope that discussion on this subject should not take place again.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: We were suggested that we should give modern weapons to our forces. And, we are giving modern weapons to our forces. We will give them the modern vehicles. We will give them the modern communicaiton system. We are thinking of giving them some armored vehicles so that in the difficult areas they will be able to do their work effectively.

We have fenced our Western borders. The Army has done that. I must, on the floor of this Hosue, say that they have done a very good job. In Rajasthan and Gujarat also fencing has been done. We have about 4,500 Kms. of border with Bangladesh. I am only giving you the rough figure. Here, erection of boundary is taking sometime. We shall have to pay more attention here.

As far as modernisation of police force is concerned, one decision, which the Government of India has taken, is this. In the past some Commissions were appointed and they had given some recommendations. All the recommendations have not been implemented. Some recommendations have been implemented and some remain to be implemented. We have decided to find out the recommendaitons which have not been implemented and implement them without any loss of time. If there are any recommendations which cannot be implemented, we say that they are not implementable. Then, we would like to have one more Commission appointed for this purpose.

Then, Sir, intelligence is the most important thing. We shall have to build intelligence. The intelligence gathering machinery is with the Defence Ministry, with the Union Government and with the State Governments. And, there are also some other agencies. But, this is one of the weakest wings and we shall have to take very strong steps. I need not go into the details of what steps should be taken by the Government of India.

As far as our relations with our neighbouring countries are concerned, I would say that this is one of the most important points which has been raised. As far as our relations with Pakistan are concerned, the hon. Prime Minister met the hon. President of Pakistan and they thought that they would be able to do something which will improve the situation. The previous Government had also done some work in this direction and this Government is also doing. Sir, the Foreign Ministers have met, the Secretary-level meetings are taking place and the DG-level meetings are also taking place. The statements have been made from the other side of the border that they would not allow their territory to be used for terrorist activities. That statement has been made; yet, we do think that terrorist activities are taking palce. We would not fully blame the Government. Because, even if they express their intention, probably, they have not been able to put it into practice effectively and not been able to curb the actual terrorist activities there. It is sometimes difficult also. I am not shifting the blame to them. But these kinds of efforts are being made. And, we hope that this will help us. If the infiltration has come down it is because of the border and because of the....

As far as Nepal is concerned, something is going on there. It is causing concern to us. Mr. Alexander was very right that it might have an impact on the situation in our country also, in certain States. We keeping a watch over it. How to deal with it, we shall have to decide. The Nepal Government has to take the decision and take the action also. As to how we can protect our interest in our territory we are seeing to it; and we are talking to the Government of Nepal also.

So far as Bhutan is concerned, we know that Bhutan *Naresh* and Bhutan did help India to act against the terrorists on their territory. And, that has helped us. But if that is causing concern to them and causing concern to us also, we shall have to take steps. We are aware of this fact. We will not err in doing our duty in this respect.

As far as Myanmar is concerned, their President, their highest leader, had come here. He had talks with our Prime Minister and with our Government also. They have said that they would help in seeing that terrorist activities taking place on their territory do not take place. And, I do think, Sir, they have started taking some steps. It would help them; and, it would help us also.

As far as Bangladesh is concerned, the statements have been made. We have brought this to their notice. Our Home Secretary will speak to their Home Secretary. The DG, BSF and the DG, Bangla Rifles have been speaking to each other. We would also like the Foreign Secretaries and the Foreign Ministers to talk to each other. I am sure that our Prime Minister, when he would be attending the SAARC meeting, of course, this matter will not be discussed in the SAARC Conference, but when they meet bilaterally, this matter may be discussed with them. The responses that we are getting from Bangladesh are, I must say, in positive terms. But they are not very convincing. If a better response comes, we will be more happy. We are talking to them.

Sir, as far as other countries are concerned, we have entered into 18 agreements with other countries of the world for mutual assistance in legal matters. And, some more agreements will be signed with some big countries also, like, Russia, America, Arab Countries, and other neighbouring countries also. We have signed nearly 30 agreements with other countries, under which the provision for extradition is also provided.

So far as the United Nations is concerned, all the resolutions passed by the General Assembly in the Security Council are acceptable to us. We are bound by them. We will follow them. The Security Council of the United Nations has decided to declare certain organization, in the world, as terrorist organizations. And, by amending our law, the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act, we have said that such organizations will be treated as terrorist organizations in the country.

As far as the laws are concerned, we have withdrawn the POTA and the other law has been introduced. I would like to submit to this House that as far as the criminal law amendment is concerned, that is a good law. Mr. Jaitley knows that. He had a hand in suggesting certain things. We would certainly like to do something in this respect.

Then, there are some suggestions, given by General Shankar Roy Chowdhury. They are very good suggestions. But, Sir, as a layperson, I would not be in a position to say 'Yes, Sir' immediately. But they are good suggestions we will examine them carefully. He suggests that there should be a federal police force. But, then, we have a federal police force. The paramilitary force is a federal police force. Then, he has said that federal investigation should be allowed. The CBI is a federal investigating

agency. But if you want to use these organizations in the States, we shall have to deal with constitutional provisions also. And on this point there is a difficulty. There is a difficulty. The State Governments would not easily agree to it because what they say that this is our jurisdiction; this is our territory, you should not enter it. That is the area in which we shall have to do something. Now, Sir, once again, I would like to say that let us help each other to see that the security situation in the country becomes better. Let us not contribute to terrorism. Some people may contribute to terrorism by using arms. Wrong-rumours are spread in the country. What is spread in the country is terror! We have said that we will not fear to talk, or talk out of fear. But supposing the talking, writing or misinterpreting is done in a manner which generates fear, that would not be useful.

I am sure, the hon. Members have spoken from the depths of their hearts and we have noted all the suggestions given by them. We will act on them. Sir, I will request you, not immediately, but on occasions, you do allow us to discuss this thing because this is the only place where we can speak authentically. Outside, what we speak may appear in the newspapers in a different form and that may create misunderstanding rather than understanding. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri C. Ramachandraiah.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, what is this ? .....*(Interruptions)*... Here also you are trying to rule the roost. .....*(Interruptions)*...

श्री सभापति : यूं मत करिए। बोलिए। ....(व्यवधान).. Make a very short speech, Mr. Ramachandraiah.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Yes, Sir. He was very eloquent in making his case. But the facts are different. Sir, I want to advise and I want to warn that you have created and strengthened anarchy and militant forces in this country to subserve your political interests. And in that process we have lost ... .*(Interruptions)*... great leaders. The country has paid the penalty. .....*(Interruptions)*...

श्री सभापति : बैठिए, बैठिए। ....(व्यवधान)..

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: And you are repeating the same mistake in Andhra Pradesh. If you leave it to the discretion of the State and if the

3.00 P.M.

circumstances so warrant that we have to negotiate with the Naxalites, then, why has it not been done in other States which are more affected with Naxalism? I know the reason. You know the reason. You don't want to reveal it to the House. You had a tacit understanding with the Naxalites .....*(Interruptions)*... Sir, If anybody speaks against Naxalites, he will be physically liquidated. Today I am prepared to become a sacrificial goat and tell the truth to the nation. .....*(Interruptions)*... Your party has colluded with the Naxalites to physically eliminate my leader. .....*(Interruptions)*... ..to physically eliminate my leader. .....*(Interruptions)*... The culprits... .....*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Can he prove that allegation? .....*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am on a Point of Order. .....*(Interruptions)*...

श्री सभापति : बैठिए, बैठिए। ....(**व्यवधान**)..

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Karnataka): Can he prove it? .....*(Interruptions)*... Let him prove it.....*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, it should not be allowed. .....*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAJEEV SHUKLA: Sir, either he should withdraw or .....*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, I am on a Point of Order. .....*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes. बैठ जाइए, बैठ जाइए।....(**व्यवधान**)... होम मिनिस्टर बोल देंगे।. ...(**व्यवधान**)... जो कहना है उन्हीं से कह देंगे।....(**व्यवधान**)... आप बैठ जाइए।....(**व्यवधान**)... बैठिए, बैठिए।....(**व्यवधान**)..मैंने यह सब देख लिया है।....(**व्यवधान**).. आप बैठ जाइए। आप मत बोलिए ....(**व्यवधान**)... बैठिए, बैठिए।..(**व्यवधान**)...बैठिए तो सही ....(**व्यवधान**)... ठीक है, मैंने देख लिया है, बैठ जाइए।...(**व्यवधान**)...

प्रो॰ राम देव भंडारी: सर, इसको प्रोसीडिंग में से निकाल दीजिए।....(**व्यवधान**)... बहुत गलत आरोप लगा रहे है।....(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, I am not yielding .....*(Interruptions)*...

Sir, ...*(Interruptions)*... The persons who are accused in the assassination of my Chief Minister have been invited to the talks with red carpet welcome. The perpetrators of that crime against my Cheif Minister's life have been invited to the talks with red carpet welcome. .....*(Interruptions)*... And, what conclusion do you want me to draw? .....*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is enough. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C RAMACHANDRAIAH: How are you going to say that? ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat Mr. Ramachandraiah. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: The State Government is virtually beseeching, prostrating before the Naxalites. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... You have already spoken. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C RAMACHANDRAIAH: You have set an example there. ...*(Interruptions)*... you have set an example. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: This is a sweeping remark. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, he should not be allowed to speak. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Why should he be not allowed to speak? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: You come from Pondicherry, a small State. You do not know anything about Andhra. ...*(Interruptions)*... You sit down. On everything, you will say something. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is enough. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... Don't make personal charges. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: The Congress leaders in Andhra Pradesh

are taking advantage of a situation that if anybody speaks against Naxalities, he will be eliminated. ...*(Interruptions)*... So, that precarious situation is being exploited by this party in Andhra Pradesh. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have brought this to the notice of the Home Minister. That is all right. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, if the Home Minister claims that the number of murders has been reduced to two, the cause of it is the ceasefire. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is because of ceasefire. ...*(Interruptions)*... Today, your Government is at the mercy of Naxalites in Andhra Pradesh. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ramachandraiah, please sit down ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN-SOZ: Sir, I may be allowed to raise a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am on a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Your Government is not strong. People are approaching Naxalites to get the things done. ...*(Interruptions)*... They are not going to your representatives. ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, I am on a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take you seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please take your seat. That is enough. ...*(Interruptions)*... That is enough. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Balbir Punj. ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, I am on a point of order, ...*(Interruptions)*... Kindly see it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have seen it. ...*(Interruptions)*... I know what point of order you are trying to raise. ...*(Interruptions)*... I have seen the book. ...*(Interruptions)*... No; no; I won't allow. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Leaders are being murdered there. ...*(Interruptions)*... Your party is colluding with them. ...*(Interruptions)*... You are prepared to go to any extent. ...*(Interruptions)*... That is your history. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, this cannot be allowed. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayanasamy, please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... Shri Balbir Punj.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, you have to allow me. I am on a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: You are responsible for this disaster. ...*(Interruptions)*... What point of order have you got? ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: You are the Chairman. Your discretion will prevail. But, Sir, you have to listen to me. ...*(Interruptions)*... I had to cry hoarse, Why? ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order? ...*(Interruptions)*... Please come to the point ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, this will create anarchy. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ramachandraiah, you take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please take your seat.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, under Rule 178 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, it is said that since this is not a formal motion, so, after the Minister replies, nobody can speak. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am quoting it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No; please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... No; I have allowed him. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... I rule it out . ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: But this is the rule. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes; Yes; I have allowed him. ...*(Interruptions)*... I have allowed ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Balbir Punj. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

Mr. Balbir Punj. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री लालू प्रसाद: सर, हमारा स्टेटमेंट है। इस तरह से हमारा समय खराब हो रहा है, सर।

श्री सभापति: आपका क्या बर्बाद हो रहा है। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री लालू प्रसाद: सर, हमको सुन लीजिए।

श्री सभापति: सुनेंगे, दो मिनट रुकिए। ...(व्यवधान)... मैंने उन्हें एलाऊ कर दिया है। बोलिए, बलबीर पुंज जी। Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Yes; Mr. Punj.

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Home Minister sounded very noble, when he said that he considers himself as the *Karta* of the family, who is talking to his errant children. So, I am grateful to him. We know the parentage of the Naxalites who are killing and maiming people across the country. Thank you for this open admission. Now, Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Home Minister, did they keep a pre-condition for the Naxalites that they would give up arms and express faith in the Indian Constitution, before the negotiation started? Was this condition put forth? Can the Government of India or the State Government talk to anybody who refuses to lay down arms and anyone who refuses to express faith in the Constitution of India?

Secondly, he has quoted figures to say that the number of killings in Andhra Pradesh has come down. They will come down, because, if you don't stop these people and the security forces are asked to withdraw, naturally you are giving a free run of a place to them; this is because of the ceasefire.

Thirdly, in Andhra Pradesh, is it not a fact that the statues of those naxalites who have been killed in police action are being raised at various public places and they are being termed as *shaheed,* martyrs? Now, if they are martyrs, what about the brave policemen who have laid down their lives while defending the State, while defending the rule of law? If you are going to raise statues of the Naxalites, who have waged a war against the State of India, what would you do about the policemen who have laid down their lives defending the honour of the country?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to clarify?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, very simply put, the leader of the Telugu Desam Party, Shri Chandrababu Naidu, has been my friend, and if there is any danger to his life, it would be the responsibility of all of us to protect him, and the State Government would provide him security. But let not others be more royal than the King. ...*(Interruptions)*... Terrorism develops out of irrationality and let us not ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, the other point is ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Why do you invite them for talks then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, he is trying to ...*(Interruptions)*... what made you to invite them...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, take your seat...*(Interruptions)*... Now I will not allow you...*(Interruptions)*... I won't allow you...*(Interruptions)*... I won't allow...*(Interruptions)*...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): How could you ask for clarification after the Minister has made the reply? ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ramachandraiah, please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: We will always by loyal to our party and our leaders....*(Interruptions)*... We will always be loyal to our party and our leaders. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Please, don't be more loyal than the king...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: We would be more loyal...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, the hon. Member on the other side is using his wit and ingenuity to confuse the House...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, we salute the martyrs who have laid down their lives while protecting others, and I would request you to insult their memory by raising issues like this....*(Interruptions)*... We will respect them. ...*(Interruptions)*... We will

salute them and do all that is necessary to remember how they have sacrificed their lives for your lives and my life, for your limbs and my limbs, for protecting your property and my property. Don't think that we would be less respectful to them than other persons. All other things are unnecessary. If I have said that we have to behave like a *karta*, it means a responsible person, and it is not the Home Minister who alone can be the *karta*; it is you, the Parliament, the Government, which would behave like a *karta*, and not one individual.

विपक्ष के नेता (श्री जसवन्त सिंह): चेयरमैन सर, मेरा इरादा इस बहस में शरीक होने का नहीं था और न माननीय मंत्री जी से मुझे कोई स्पष्टीकरण पूछना था, परन्तु इस बहस ने जो रूप ले लिया है, जिस प्रकार का प्रवचन और उपदेश दिया जा रहा है, मैंने सोचा कि माननीय मंत्री जी से स्पष्टीकरण के तौर पर अवश्य पूछूं कि क्या माननीय मंत्री जी को मालूम है कि नक्सली संगठन पीपुल्स वॉर ग्रुप के मिलिट्री कमांडर और पोलित ब्यूरो के सदस्य प्रदीप ने टेलीविजन पर बात की थी, मंत्री जी अगर आपस में बात कर रहे हैं तो क्या हम चुप रहें? क्या माननीय गृह मंत्री जी को मालूम है कि नक्सली संगठन पीपुल्स वॉर ग्रुप के मिलिट्री कमांडर और पोलित ब्यूरो के सदस्य प्रदीप ने टी॰ वी॰ इंटरव्यू दिया था? मैं सारे टी॰वी॰ इंटरव्यू का यहां उल्लेख नहीं कर रहा हूं। एक-दो प्रश्न और उनके जवाबों का उत्तर देता हूं, क्योंकि वे जो अभी प्रश्न उठे थे, उनके सांदर्भिक हैं। एक प्रश्न पूछा गया था कि आंध्र प्रदेश में सरकार क्यों बदली है? उसके जवाब में माननीय प्रदीप जी ने कहा, जी हां। कांग्रेस ने हमसे जो वायदा किया था, उसके मुताबिक हम आगे काम करेंगे। उसके बाद उनसे पूछा गया कि आपकी बातचीत क्या हुई है, उन्होंने कहा कि हमने जंग का पहले वायदा किया था, तब हमारी जंग और जंग का ऐलान जारी रहेगा। उसके बाद उनसे पूछा गया कि आपका मक़सद क्या है? उन्होंने कहा कि हमारा मक़सद है सरकारी मशीनरी को बंद करना। फिर उनसे पूछा गया कि क्या राज्य के मुख्यमंत्री पद को निशाना बनाया जाता है, उन्होंने जवाब दिया - जी हां, आप ठीक कह रहे हैं। श्री चंद्रबाबू नायडू को हमने निशाना बनाया। यह इंटरव्यू उन्होंने टी॰वी॰ पर दिया है, चोरी-छिपे नहीं दिया है। फिर उनसे पूछा गया कि आपका संगठन कहां है और कितने राज्यों में है, उत्तर में उन्होंने कहा कि हमारा संगठन बारह-तेरह राज्यों में है और बहुत सोच-समझ कर हमने ये कदम उठाए हैं। ये राजनैतिक कदम केवल आंध्रप्रदेश के लिए ही नहीं हैं, ये सारे देश के लिए हैं। मैं पूरा इंटरव्यू नहीं पढ़ रहा हूं, इसकी कॉपी इनके पास है।

एक माननीय सदस्य: बहुत हो गया।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह: बहुत अभी नहीं हुआ, बहुत तो आगे होगा। आगे उनसे पूछा गया कि फिर ये हथियार आपके पास कहां से आते हैं, उन्होंने कहा कि ये हथियार तो मुख्य रूप से राज्यों से ही आते

हैं और राज्यों पर हमला करके ही हम हथियार लेते हैं। अभी हमने कोरापुट पर हमला किया, तब पूरा ज़िला मुख्यालय हमने सीज़ कर लिया था। हमने 540 हथियार छीने। यह जुलाई-अगस्त की बात है। फिर पूछा गया कि ऐसा कहा जाता है कि एल॰टी॰टी॰ई॰ के साथ ही आपके तार जुड़े हुए हैं? यह सीधा सवाल टीवी पर पूछा गया। ऐसा लगातार कहा गया है कि क्या एल॰टी॰टी॰ई॰ के साथ भी आपके तार जुड़े हैं और क्या बाक़ायदा उन्होंने ट्रेनिंग दी है? तब उन्होंने कहा कि हां, यह सही है, युद्ध चलाना है तो ट्रेनिंग भी जरूरी है और हमने युद्ध का रास्ता चुना है। ये जो चुनाव यहां होते हैं वे पूरी तरह झूठ हैं और इस बार भी चुनाव में सब नंगा हुआ है। जनता हंस रही है, इसलिए हमने दीर्घकालीन युद्ध का रास्ता चुना है और दूसरे दलों ने हमारी बात नहीं मानी, किंतु कांग्रेस ने आम जनता के सामने हमारी बात मानी है। उसने चुनाव घोषणा पत्र में शामिल किया है इसलिए हम उनकी मदद कर रहे हैं। मैं कोई अपने मन से बात नहीं कह रहा हूं। मैं यह पत्र भी आपको लिखने वाला था। यदि आप कहें तो उसे मैं टेबल पर रख सकता हूं। .....(**व्यवधान**)

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Let the House be aware of this. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: You prove it. ..(*Interruptions*).. You prove it. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Take the support of Naxalites. ...(*Interruptions*)... Take the support of Naxalites and liquidate all Opposition members. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: ऐसे कई इंटरव्यू आपसे संबंध वाले बता दिए जाएंगे। लिट्टे के कई इंटरव्यू हम दिखा देंगे। हम कई मिलिटैंट्स के इंटरव्यू आपको दिखा देते हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री सभापति: बैठिए, आप बैठिए।

श्री शिवराज वी॰ पाटिल: श्रीमन् मेरे लिए तो बहुत मुश्किल हो गई है। अगर लीडर ऑफ द अपोज़ीशन अपना भाषण पहले करते तब मैं उसका पूरा जवाब दे देता। इन्होंने दस-पंद्रह प्रश्न मेरे भाषण के बाद दिए हैं उनका जवाब मांगते हैं और उस काग़ज के आधार पर मांगते हैं जो न तो उनकी फाइल में है और न ही गवर्नमेंट की फाइल में है। वे इसे कहां से लाए हैं, यह हमें मालूम नहीं है। वह सही भी है या नहीं है, यह हमको मालूम नहीं है और आप कहते हैं कि हमें उस पर विश्वास करना चाहिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री एस॰एस॰ अहलुवालिया: यह टैलीविज़न में टैलीकास्ट हुआ है।

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY (Gujarat): Sir, is it legalising the issue of terrorism? ..(*Interruptions*)

श्री शिवराज वी॰ पाटिल: श्रीमन, इस प्रकार से !..(**व्यवधान**) Please don't disturb me. श्रीमन, इस प्रकार से सदन का काम हो सकता है ऐसा मैं नहीं समझता। लीडर आफ दि अपोजिशन के खिलाफ बोलने में मुझे जरा तकलीफ होती है। मगर क्या करें कि आप इस प्रकार से मुझे प्रश्न पूछ रहे हैं, इस प्रकार का कागज दे रहे हैं तो वह किसी रूल में नहीं बैठता है और आप फिर मुझे पूछ रहे हैं कि उसका जवाब दे दो। बल्कि क्या यह कोई ठीक बात होगी। वह भी ऐसे प्रश्न पूछ रहे हैं जिसमें आप मेरे पर भी कुछ आरोप कर रहे हैं, पार्टी पर भी आरोप कर रहे हैं और हम अच्छी बात कर रहे हैं तो हम साधुता की बात कर रहे हैं बल्कि ऐसा बोल रहे हैं। उसके अंदर व्यंग्य भी कर रहे हैं। अब इसका जवाब कैसे दें, सर। ...(**व्यवधान**).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The matter is over. Discussions are over.

श्री जसवन्त सिंह: देखिए , यह मेरे बहुत पुराने कई वर्षों से पुराने मित्र भी हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**) चेयरमैन साहब, मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि साधारणतया ऐसा होता नहीं। क्या मैंने इस बारे में आपसे जुलाई, अगस्त में चर्चा की या नहीं की? आपके पास इस सारे टी॰वी॰ इंटरव्यू की कॉपियां हैं या नहीं हैं, तो माननीय गृह मंत्री ...(**व्यवधान**) चेयरमैन साहब के पास हैं ...(**व्यवधान**) और हमने चिट्ठी लिखी है। ...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री सभापति: चेयरमैन को इंवोल्व मत करिए। ...(**व्यवधान**) बैठिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: नहीं-नहीं, इसको रिकार्ड से निकाला जाए। आसंदी से प्रश्न पूछने की व्यवस्था कभी नहीं रही है सदन में। ...(**व्यवधान**) इसको सदन की कार्यवाही से विलोपित किया जाए, वरना यह नयी परम्परा हो जाएगी। ...(**व्यवधान**) वे विपक्ष के आदरणीय नेता हैं, एक नई परंपरा हो जाएगी। ...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री सभापति: मैं जवाब नहीं दूंगा। ...(**व्यवधान**) मैंने कहा कि मुझे इंवोल्व मत करिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री शिवराज वी॰ पाटिल: सर, अगर यह रिकार्ड में जाएगा तो आप बोलेंगे कि हमने जवाब नहीं दिया। ...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: जिस लिट्टे का हमारे दिवंगत नेता श्री राजीव गांधी जी की हत्या में हाथ रहा उस लिट्टे से किस-किस के संबंध थे, क्या इस पर चर्चा करना चाहेंगे आप? ...(**व्यवधान**) क्या इस नेक्सलाइट मुवमेंट के और लिट्टे के आपस में संबंध हैं क्या उस पर आप चर्चा करना चाहेंगे? ...(**व्यवधान**) आज आपको सर्टिफिकेट की आवश्यकता पड़ गई। यह गैर जिम्मेदाराना बातें यहां उठाना, मैं सोचता हूं यह सही नहीं है। ...(**व्यवधान**).

श्री सभापति: डिस्कसन खत्म। अब कोई डिस्कसन नहीं है इस पोइंट पर। बैठिए। लालू जी, बोलिए।...(**व्यवधान**)

एक माननीय सदस्य: इसको सदन के रिकार्ड से निकालने का आदेश दीजिए, सर।...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री आनन्द शर्मा (हिमाचल प्रदेश): सभापति महोदय, यह बहुत गंभीर बात है। मुझे एक मिनट के लिए सुना जाए ...(**व्यवधान**) सभापति महोदय, आंतरिक सुरक्षा पर चर्चा हुई, अरुण शौरी जी ने आरंभ की तथा विपक्ष की तरफ से सब लोग बोले, हमारी तरफ से भी हम लोगों ने सदन में अपनी बात रखी। आंतरिक सुरक्षा राष्ट्र के लिए चिंता का विषय है यह हम सब मानते हैं। गृह मंत्री के बोलने के बाद विपक्ष के नेता की तरफ से एक ऐसा किसी व्यक्ति का इंटरव्यू पढ़ा गया जिसमें ...(**व्यवधान**) मुझे बोलने दीजिए, मेरा अधिकार है।...(**व्यवधान**) आप बोल सकते हैं बाद में। ...(**व्यवधान**) I have a right. I am a Member of this House.... (*Interruptions).*

श्री सभापति: आप बोलने क्यों नहीं देते, सुनिए वे क्या बोल रहे हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**) बैठिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री आनन्द शर्मा: सभापति महोदय, मैं एक बात साफ कहना चाहता हूं कि जो लिट्टे की बात की गई है लिट्टे जिम्मेदार है कांग्रेस के नेता-हमारे प्रधान मंत्री श्री राजीव गांधी की हत्या के। लिट्टे पर बेन कांग्रेस सरकार ने लगाया। आप इस तरह से इस सदन में यह बात पटल पर रखी गई, इसको रिकार्ड से निकाला जाए।...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री सभापति: मैं रिकार्ड देखूंगा। लालू जी, आप बोलिए, ...(**व्यवधान**) आप बैठ जाइए। ...(**व्यवधान**)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, will that go in the record? Otherwise, they will say that I have not replied...(*Interruptions)*... otherwise, I will not be in a position to reply.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Let there be a separate discussion on this issue....(*Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: He has placed the interview before the House under rules. How can it be expunged?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Under which rule, can it be admitted? You show the rule under which it can be admitted. ..(*Interruptions).*

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु (पश्चिमी बंगाल): यह क्या एडवांस नोटिस था। सर,यह जो रखा गया,

क्योंकि इसमें एलीगेशंस हैं। This is a procedural issue. सर, हमारी व्यवस्था के मुताबिक ...(**व्यवधान**) सर, हमारी व्यवस्था के मुताबिक, अगर आथंटिकेट करके पहले से उन्होंने नोटिस दिया है, तो आप उसको एक्सेप्ट कर सकते हैं। सर, मैं इसके कंटेक्स्ट में नहीं जाता, But this is a procedural issue. सर, मैं, आपसे अर्ज़ करना चाहूंगा कि आप रूल्स में जाइये। अगर बिना नोटिस दिये, ऐसे ऐलिगेशन होगा, इन डाक्युमेंट्स के ऊपर, तो यह उचित नहीं है। अगर इसके बारे में अग्रिम नोटिस दिया हो और आपसे परमिशन ली हो, तो यह रिकार्ड में आ सकता है। ...(**व्यवधान**).. Let the Leader of the Opposition....(*Interruptions*)... Let the notice be come. Sir, this is a very serious matter.

श्री एस॰ एस॰ अहलुवालिया: सभापति महोदय। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सभापति: आप बैठ जाइये। ...(**व्यवधान**)... आप बैठ जाइये। मैं बोल रहा हूं। मैं आपको बताता हूं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, advance notice has to be given that he will make allegations on the basis of this paper, which he is now authenticating, and, if you are agreeing to it, only then it can be taken into consideration, and, this is clearly the rule...(*Interruptions*)...This is the rule.

श्री सभापति: आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिए।..(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस॰ एस॰ अहलुवालिया: सर, यह टी॰वी॰ पर दिया गया इंटरव्यू है। उसको रिकार्ड से कैसे ..(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सभापति: आप बोलने तो दीजिए।..(**व्यवधान**)... आप बैठ जाइये। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: सर, रूल्स के बाहर तो नहीं जा सकते हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस॰ एस॰ अहलुवालिया: सभापति महोदय। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री आनन्द शर्मा: क्या आप हमको प्रमाण पत्र देंगे? ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सभापति: मैं कोई प्रमाण पत्र नहीं दे रहा हूं।...(**व्यवधान**)... आप एक मिनट बैठ जाइये। आप एक मिनट बैठ जाइये। ...(**व्यवधान**)... आप बैठ जाइये। आप बैठ जाइये। ...(**व्यवधान**)... मैं माननीय सदस्यों ...(**व्यवधान**)... आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिए। मैं माननीय सदस्यों की जानकारी के लिए कहना चाहता हूं कि जो कुछ अभी जसवन्त सिंह जी ने पढ़कर सुनाया। यह पिछले सत्र में इन्होंने मुझे दिया था। ये इस पर डिसकस करना चाहते थे। लेकिन मैंने कहा कि अभी डिसकस करने की जरूरत नहीं है, कभी इंटरनल सेक्योरिटी का मामला आये और

उस पर कभी हाउस में चर्चा हो...(**व्यवधान**)... आप ठहर जाइये। ...(**व्यवधान**)... उस समय ...(**व्यवधान**)...

प्रो॰ सैफुद्दीन सोज: सर, होम मिनिस्टर की तकरीर के बाद क्या ...(**व्यवधान**)...

†پروفیسر سیف الدین سوز: سر، ہوم منسٹر کی تقریر کے بعد کیا..... مداخلت.....

श्री सभापति: आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)... आप क्या बात कह रहे हैं? ...(**व्यवधान**)... मै कह रहा हूं कि पिछले सत्र में इन्होंने यह मुझे दिखाया था। पिछले सत्र में कोई काम नहीं हुआ। मैंने इनसे कहा कि इस सत्र में काम होने वाला नहीं है, नेक्सट सेशन में इसको देखा जायेगा। आप इसको उठाना चाहें,तो उस समय उठा लेना। आज इन्होंने इस समय उठाया है, पहले उठाते, तो ज्यादा अच्छा रहता। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी (पश्चिमी बंगाल): सर, पहले उठाते तो अच्छा रहता। ...(**व्यवधान**)... Sir, you allowed comments on the statement...*(Interruption)*... He replied to the debate and, all of a sudden he comes to this issue....*(Interruptions)*...

श्री सभापति: आप बोलिए। रेल मंत्री जी, आप बोलिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: स्टेटमेंट का मतलब ...(**व्यवधान**)... उन्होंने डिबेट में भाग लिया अलग-अलग परम्परायें हाउस में चल रही हैं। यह नई परम्परा हाउस में चल रही है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सभापति: नई परम्पराएं तो कई चालू हो गई हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: स्टेटमेंट का रिप्लाई दिया। The queries can be raised in the reply...*(interruption)*...पहले नोटिस दिया जाता है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: आदरणीय सभापति महोदय, इसे रिकार्ड से हटा दीजियें...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, let me please submit., मैं बड़ी विनम्रता से कहूंगा कि लीडर आफ दि अपोजीशन को इस बात को उठाने के लिए कभी भी इजाजत दी जा सकती है। अगर वह पहले बोल देते तो, क्या होता अब वे लास्ट में मेरा भाषण होने के बाद दे रहे हैं। सर, कानून बता है, रूल बताता है कि अगर किसी के खिलाफ एलिगेशन है, तो मिनिस्टर को नोटिस देना है, नोटिस देने के बाद, उसकी जांच-पड़ताल करके उनको बताया जाता है। यह जो कहा जा रहा है, या सब कुछ ठीक है। उसके बाद यह हो जाता है। आज परिस्थिति ऐसी हो गई है कि उन्होंने उठकर बताया, मेरे कहने के बाद बताया। हम आज ऐसी परिस्थिति में आ गये हैं, लोग कहेंगे कि आप जवाब देने की भी हालत में नहीं हैं।..(**व्यवधान**)...

†Transliteration of Urdu Script.

श्री बलबीर के॰ पुंज (उत्तर प्रदेश): यह बात सही है।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री शिवराज वी. पाटिल: आप कल उठाइये।...(**व्यवधान**)... आप कल उठाइये। ...(**व्यवधान**)...मैं उसका जवाब दूंगा।...(**व्यवधान**)...आप कल उठाइये। जीरो आवर में उठाइये, नोटिस देकर उठाइये। मैं उसका कल जवाब दे दूंगा। सर, आज कैसे होगा? हमको उसका पता नहीं है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...आप एलिगेशन कर रहे हैं। Sir, it should ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: सर, यह प्रोसीज़र का मामला है। इसमें आपको रूलिंग देनी चाहिए। ....(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सभापति: मैं इसको देख लूंगा ..(**व्यवधान**)..

श्री शिवराज वी॰ पाटिल: सर, अगर किसी के खिलाफ एलिगेशन करेंगे तो उसको कोई सफाई देने का मौका नहीं मिलेगा?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I am raising a very serious procedural question. We respect the Leader of the House, we respect the Leader of the Opposition, and, I think there are several new Members who would like to learn procedural issues from, at least, the Leader of the House, and, the Leader of the Opposition, and, if we create such wrong precedents, I think the future of this great House is in extreme danger. Therefore, Sir, in the interest of the future of this House, you must give a ruling on this procedural issue, whether the Leader of the Opposition had given you advance notice along with the authenticated copy of the transcript of the television interview, and, whether your office was passed this on to the Hon. Minister and brought to his notice that this kind of allegation will come. Sir, that is the procedure about which the Rules of Business is very clear. Sir, on that procedural issue, I therefore, seek your clarification.

श्री सभापति: ठीक है, ठीक है।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह: चेयरमैन साहब, माननीय सदस्यों को जो आपत्ति या तकलीफ हुई है, वह मोटे रूप से दो-तीन मसलों पर अटकी हुई है। एक तो कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा, मंत्री जी भी उसमें शरीक हैं, कि मैंने कोई कायदे-कानून से हटकर अचानक ऐसी कोई बात कह दी है ...(**व्यवधान**)...

कुछ माननीय सदस्य: बिलकुल वही बात है, वही बात है।

श्री सभापति: बोलने दीजिए।...(**व्यवधान**)... ठीक है, ठीक है।...(**व्यवधान**)... बोलिए।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह: चेयरमैन साहब, मैं यह अर्ज़ कर रहा था कि जब माननीय सदस्य ने यहां

अपनी पीड़ा व्यक्त की, आंध्र प्रदेश की पीड़ा व्यक्त की, तो माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने अपना जवाब देते वक्त भी हम सबको काफी प्रवचन दिया- प्रेम का, प्यार का, कि कैसे इस समस्या का हल निकालना चाहिए। उस वक्त ऐसी कोई बात नहीं हुई थी। वैसे मंत्रियों के वक्तव्य के बाद भी स्पष्टीकरण दिए जाते हैं, यह प्रथा है। इसमें माननीय सदस्य ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री आनन्द शर्मा: आरोप नहीं लगाए जाते।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह: एक मिनट, मेरी बात तो सुनिए ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: यह आरोप है ही नहीं।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य: किस पर आरोप है? ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री रूद्रनारायण पणि: कोई आरोप नहीं है। ...(**व्यवधान**)... यह आरोप नहीं है।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह: फिर माननीय मंत्री जी ने स्वयं अपने जवाब के दौरान फरमाया था कि कोई बात रह जाती है, और कई बार बातें रह जाती हैं, तो जो कोई बात रह जाती है, जब मैं अपनी बात पूरी कर लूं, उसके बाद माननीय सदस्य पूछ लें। ऐसा अक्सर होता है कि कोई बात रह जाती है तो उसका स्पष्टीकरण हो जाता है। अगर यह बात हमारे मित्रों को नहीं सुहा रही है तो उसका ...(**व्यवधान**)...

†**प्रो॰ सैफुद्दीन सोज:** Separate notice दे दीजिए, उसका जवाब आ जाएगा। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

Separate notice

श्री सभापति: ठहरिए... ठहरिए...

श्री जसवन्त सिंह: महोदय, एक यह मसला उठाया गया कि अगर ये नोटिस देते और बहस में शरीक होते, तो मैं उसका जवाब देता। अभी तो ऐसे एकदम से मसला उठा दिया है और इसको ऐसे कहा जा रहा है, जैसे हमको जवाब नहीं मालूम। चेयरमैन साहब, मेरा निवेदन है कि यह मसला कोई मेरा या मंत्री जी का निजी मसला नहीं है। मैंने किसी पर कोई आरोप नहीं लगाया है। यह मंत्री जी पर आरोप नहीं है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

†**प्रो॰ सैफुद्दीन सोज:** इलज़ाम लगाया है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

الزام کا کیا ہے.....مداخلت.....

†Transliteration of Urdu Script.

श्री जसवन्त सिंह: और वे जो जम्मू-कश्मीर के माननीय सदस्य हैं, जिनको सबसे ज्यादा तकलीफ् हो रही है, मैंने तो उनका नाम ही नहीं लिया और न उनकी किसी बात पर टिप्पणी की।. ..**(व्यवधान)**...

प्रो॰ सैफुद्दीन सोज: उनकी नीयत की खराबी है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

†پروفیسر سیف الدین سوز: ان کی نیت کی خرابی ہے.....اخات.....

श्री एस॰एस॰ अहलुवालिया: सर, इसको रिकॉर्ड से निकाल दीजिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**... ये नीयत की खराबी कह रहे हैं ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री सभापति: बैठिए... बैठिए ...**(व्यवधान)**...

†प्रो॰ सैफुद्दीन सोज: हमें बराबरी का हक है। ...**(व्यवधान)**... हमें बराबरी का हक है। ..**(व्यवधान)**...

پروفیسر سیف الدین سوز: ہمیں برابری کا حق ہے.....اخات.....ہمیں برابری کا حق ہے.....اخات.....

श्री एस॰एस॰ अहलुवालिया: ऐसे बात करते हैं कि नीयत खराब है? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री सभापति: एक मिनट...वे जवाब दे दें? ...**(व्यवधान)**... आप खत्म कीजिए।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह: अक्सर ऐसा होता है... चेयरमैन साहब, ऐसा होता है अक्सर और यह तो सर्वविदित है कि क्रोध के कारण, जैसा कहते हैं कि क्रोध के कारण बुद्धि भ्रमित हो जाती है। ... **(व्यवधान)**...

प्रो॰ रामदेव भंडारी: सरकार चले जाने के बाद भी भ्रमित हो जाती है। ...**(व्यवधान)**... जब सरकार चली जाती है, तब भी बुद्धि * हो जाती है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री सभापति: बोलिए, बोलिए, खत्म कीजिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

प्रो॰ रामदेव भंडारी: सरकार जाने के बाद भी बुद्धि* हो जाती है।

श्री सभापति: भंडारी जी, बैठिए...बैठिए।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह: चेयरमैन साहब, मेरा निवेदन है कि मैंने कोई गुप्त बात नहीं कही है। यह जो कुछ है, यह टी॰वी॰ पर एक इन्टरव्यू में आया है। यह लोगों ने देखा है। ...**(व्यवधान)**... मुझे अपनी बात कहने दीजिए। यह जो टी॰वी॰ पर इन्टरव्यू आया है, मैं इसका उल्लेख कर चुका हूं। ...**(व्यवधान)**... यह जो

†Transliteration of Urdu Script.
*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

यहां पर है, यह टी०वी० के इन्टरव्यू का वर्बेटिम रिकार्ड है। ...(**व्यवधान**)... अगर टी०वी० के इन्टरव्यू का वर्बेटिम रिकार्ड है तो ...(**व्यवधान**)... उसमें हम कैसे करें? ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: सभापति महोदय, ...(**व्यवधान**)... इसी प्रकार का प्रश्न, इस संसद में 30 नवम्बर, 2000 को उठा था। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: सभापति

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया: विपक्ष के नेता खड़े हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: तब आडवाणी जी ने यह कहा था। मैं उसको पढ़ना चाहता हूं। ...(**व्यवधान**)... इसी सदन के पटल पर, ...(**व्यवधान**)...आप सुनिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)... आडवाणी जी ने कहा था कि या तो सदन में आर्थेंटीकेट करें या इस प्रकार का कोई नोटिस दिया जाए। ...(**व्यवधान**)... जब विपक्ष के नेता आडवाणी जी का यह कथन है तो फिर उसका पालन क्यों नहीं हो रहा है? ...(**व्यवधान**)...मान्यवर, या तो ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्रीमती सविता शारदा (गुजरात): महोदय, ये खड़े हैं, ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया: नेता खड़े हैं, ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: या तो आर्थेंटीकेट किया जाए या नोटिस दिया जाए? ...(**व्यवधान**)... सदन की कार्यवाही से इसको विलोपित किया जाए। ...(**व्यवधान**)... मैं याद दिला रहा हूं। खुद आडवाणी जी ने यह कहा था, ...(**व्यवधान**)... मैं परम्परा को ही याद दिला रहा हूं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सभापति: ठीक है, ठीक है। ...(**व्यवधान**)... आप बैठ जाइए। आप बैठिए, आप बैठिए आप भी बैठ जाइए, इनको सुन लीजिए।

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: आदरणीय सभापति जी, मैं आपका अनुगृहीत हूं कि आपने मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सभापति: आप बैठिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)... इनको भी सुन लीजिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

एक सम्मानित सदस्य: यह तो अच्छा हुआ कि विपक्ष के नेता को बैठाकर ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सभापति: आप बैठिए, विपक्ष के नेता आपसे ज्यादा होशियार हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)... आपसे ज्यादा इस चीज को जानते हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)... हां, मैंने इनसे कहा है और इन्होंने मान भी लिया है।

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: सभापति जी, 30 नवम्बर, 2000 को हमारे सदन के एक सम्मानीय सदस्य

पीटर एलफांस ने लिट्टे की एक्टिविटीज के संबंध में, एक समाचारपत्र का उल्लेख करते हुए अपनी बात उठाई थी। उस समय आडवाणी जी होम मिनिस्टर थे, उन्होंने कहा था, यह Rulings and Observations from the Chair के पृष्ठ 124 पर अंकित है। मैं उसको पढ़ना चाहूंगा। "The Minister of Home Affairs, Shri L.K. Advani, appealed to the Member to have it translated," चूंकि वह समाचारपत्र तमिल में था, "and authenticate it to enable him to pursue the matter." फिर डिप्टी चेयरमैन ने उस समय रूलिंग दी और रूल 238 का हवाला भी दिया जिसमें रूल 38 के पार्ट-5 का भी जिक्र है, उस समय यह कहा, "Whether it is in any newspaper or any other document, he should give a prior notice to that person, so that he can come here and answer." ...(*Interruptions*)... I am not yielding. ...(*interruptions*)... I am not yielding. ...(*Interruptions*)... in this manner. ...(*Interruptions*)... Let me complete, after that you may also speak ...(*Interruptions*)... Sir, I am not yielding. And your allegations in this manner are wrong, they are out of order. इस बात का उल्लेख किया था। दूसरी एक और बात कही थी कि जब किसी मिनिस्टर का रेप्लाई हो जाए, तो दिनांक 16.8.1993 को जब राजेश पायलट अपना रेप्लाई दे चुके थे तब विष्णुकांत शास्त्री जी ने कुछ क्लेरिफिकेशन्स पूछने चाहे थे तब भी तत्कालीन चेयर ने यह कहा था कि वह भी, Rulings and Observations from the Chair के पृष्ठ 292 का जिक्र है। "No clarification should be sought after Minister's reply." ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, I have a point of order. ...(*Interruptions*)... Sir, the Minister is deliberately misquoting the rule. I have a point of order.

श्री एस॰एस॰ अहलुवालिया: यह चेयर के खिलाफ है ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: सामान्य तौर पर नहीं पूछे जाते हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)... यदि जसवन्त सिंह जैसे सम्मानित नेता इस प्रकार की बात कर रहे हैं तो दो बातें उभरकर आती हैं, एक यह कि वे प्रायर नोटिस दें और दूसरी आथेंटीकेट करें और इसे क्लेरिफिकेशन की श्रेणी में न लिया जाए। इसलिए इसको सदन की कार्यवाही से विलोपित किया जाए क्योंकि जसवन्त सिंह जैसे जिम्मेदार व्यक्ति, यह गैर जिम्मेदाराना बात कहें तो निश्चित रूप से सदन के लिए एक नया प्रेसिडेंट बन जाएगा।

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, my point of order is: that the Minister has deliberately misquoted the rule. He has deliberately misquoted the precedent. Rule 238A says that no allegation of a defamatory or incriminating narure shall be made by a Member against any other Member or a Member of the House unless the Member making the allegation has given previous intimation and notice. It's only if the Leader of Opposition

has made an allegation against a Member of this House that he is required to comply with rule 238A. He has not done so. The precedent which the hon. Minister has wrongly quoted with regard to a debate we had on 30th November, 2000 also mentions that when an allegation appear in a newspaper with regard to the activities of LTTE and an allegation was made against another Member and a Member of the Council of Ministers itself, only then the Home Minister got up and objected, "He has started reading 'Member' as 'any person'." Therefore, the Leader of Opposition has not made any allegation against a Member of this House. Rule 238A and this precedent is not applicable ...(*Interruption*)...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, one-sided version should not go on record. The former Law Minister has said and we have to take everything he says very carefully. I will read it to you: No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a Member against any other Member or a Member of the House unless the Member making the allegation has given previous intimation to the Chairman and also to the Minister ...(*Interruptions*)... Let me complete ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: वह तो कहा ही नहीं है ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सभापति: आप ठहरिए तो सही ...(**व्यवधान**)... बोलने दीजिए ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस॰ एस॰ अहलुवालिया: सभापति जी ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सभापति: आप बैठ जाइए न ...(**व्यवधान**)... क्यों जबर्दस्ती कर रहे हैं ...(**व्यवधान**)... जसवन्त सिंह जी, आप इनको कंट्रोल नहीं कर सकते ...(**व्यवधान**)... इन्हें बिठाइए ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस॰ एस॰ अहलुवालिया: सभापति जी, हाउस का रिकार्ड मंगाया जाए, ये टोटल गलत बोल रहे हैं ...(**व्यवधान**)... गृहमंत्री जी को जवाब देना चाहिए ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, the intimation to the Chairman and also to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply .....(*Interruptions*)....

डा॰ (श्रीमती) नजमा ए॰ हेपतुल्ला: *

श्री सभापति: आप बैठिए, मैं बोलने नहीं दूंगा ...(**व्यवधान**)... कोई रिकार्ड में नहीं जाएगा ...(**व्यवधान**)...

---

*Not Recorded.

डा॰ (श्रीमती) नजमा ए॰ हेपतुल्ला: *

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: *

श्री सभापति: आप बैठिए .....(**व्यवधान**)..... एक मिनट .....(**व्यवधान**)..... मैं आपसे जानकारी लेना चाहूंगा .....(**व्यवधान**).....

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: *

श्री सभापति: एक मिनट बैठिए .....(**व्यवधान**).....

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: *

श्री सभापति: आप जरा बैठिए .....(**व्यवधान**)..... पचौरी जी बैठिए .....(**व्यवधान**)..... एक मिनट .....(**व्यवधान**)..... एक मिनट मैं क्लैरिफिकेशन दे दूं आपको .....(**व्यवधान**)..... आप एक मिनट बैठिए .....(**व्यवधान**)..... बैठ जाइए .....(**व्यवधान**)..... आप सब बैठिए .....(**व्यवधान**).....

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: *

श्री सभापति: आप सब बैठ जाइए .....(**व्यवधान**).....

श्री एस॰ एस॰ अहलुवालिया: *

श्री सभापति: बैठिए .....(**व्यवधान**)..... गलत रूल कोट करने का सवाल नहीं है .....(**व्यवधान**)..... आप बैठिए .....(**व्यवधान**)..... नारायणसामी जी .....(**व्यवधान**)..... आप बैठिए ..... (**व्यवधान**)..... मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूं कि उन्होंने जो कुछ पढ़कर सुनाया है, उसमें किसी मैम्बर या किसी मिनिस्टर के ऊपर किसी तरह का कोई एलिगेशन नहीं लगा है .....(**व्यवधान**)..... वह बता दीजिए .....(**व्यवधान**).....

श्री शिवराज वी॰ पाटिल: सभापति जी, मुझे वही एक्सप्लेन करने दीजिए .....(**व्यवधान**).....

श्री एस॰ एस॰ अहलुवालिया: *

श्री सभापति: बोलने दीजिए .....(**व्यवधान**)..... बोलने तो दीजिए।

श्री शिवराज वी॰ पाटिल: सभापति जी, मुझे वही एक्सप्लेन करने दीजिए बोलने दीजिए .....(**व्यवधान**)..... मुझे वही एक्सप्लेन करने दीजिए कि सदन के बाहर के लोगों के खिलाफ एलीगेशन नहीं किया जा सकता, जो आदमी खुद को सदन में डिफेंड करने के काबिल नहीं है .. ...(**व्यवधान**).....

*Not Recorded.

श्री अरुण जेटली: नक्सलाइट पर आरोप नहीं लगा सकते। .....(व्यवधान)

डा० (श्रीमती) नजमा ए० हेपतुल्ला: ये गलत बात कर रहे हैं .....(व्यवधान)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, this is not correct. *(Interruptions)* This is not correct. *(Interruptions)*

श्री सभापति: सदन की कार्यवाही साढ़े चार बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned at
forty-one minutes past three of the clock.

The House re-assembled at thirty-one minutes past four of the clock,
MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned till 5 O' clock.

The House then adjourned at
thirty-one minutes past four of the clock till five of the clock.

The House re-assembled at one minute past five of the clock,
MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Re. Train Accident on the 14th December, 2004 at Jalandhar-Pathankot Section in Ferozpur Division of Northern Railway

श्री सभापति: माननीय गृह मंत्री जी के उत्तर देने के पश्चात् श्री जसवन्त सिंह जी, माननीय नेता विपक्ष, ने एक विषय उठाया। मेरी राय में सदन में चल रही बहस से मैं इसको अलग मान कर, गृह मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि उसको दिखवा लें और जब चाहें उस पर सदन को अवगत कराएं।

रेल मंत्री (श्री लालू प्रसाद): सर, 14 तारीख को बड़ी दर्दनाक घटना रेलवे में हुई और लोक सभा में मैंने अपना स्टेटमेंट देकर, ज्यों ही मालूम हुआ, लोक सभा में बयान देकर मैं घटनास्थल पर गया, महोदय। घटनास्थल पर रेल राज्य मंत्री और रेलवे बोर्ड के सभी सदस्यों को और मीडिया के लोग भी वहां थे। महोदय, वहां जाकर हमें जो काम करना था, वह किया। दोनों हाउस में दोनों राज्य मंत्री तैनात थे। लेकिन कल मुझे यह जानकारी मिली कि मेरी खोजाई हो रही है और.....

श्री सभापति: खोजाई नहीं हो रही है, आपकी खोज हो रही है।

श्री लालू प्रसाद: हां, मेरी खोज हो रही है। महोदय, माननीय अटल जी ने कहा कि where is Lalu Yadav?